









THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
JUNE 1826. . . . SEPTEMBER 1826.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

---

VOL. XLIV.

EDINBURGH:  
*Printed by the Heirs of D. Willison,*  
FOR ARCHIBALD CONSTABLE AND COMPANY, EDINBURGH:  
AND LONGMAN, REES, ORME, BROWN AND GREEN,  
LONDON.

---

1826.



## CONTENTS OF No. LXXXVII.

---

	Page
ART. I. Who Wrote Icon Basilike? By Christopher Wordsworth, D. D. Master of Trinity College, Cambridge	1
II. 1. The Gospel of St John, in Latin, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation. Executed under the immediate direction of James Hamilton.	
2. The Gospel of St John, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation from the Italian, with full Instructions for its Use, even by those who are wholly ignorant of the Language. For the Use of Schools. By James Hamilton . . . . .	47
III. The late Crisis in the Money Market impartially considered . . . . .	70
IV. A History of England, from the first Invasion of the Romans. By John Lingard, D. D. Vol. VII. and VIII. . . . .	94
V. Mœurs Administratives, pour faire suite aux Observations sur les Mœurs et les Usages Français au Commencement du XIX. Siecle . . . . .	156
VI. Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, in the Years 1822, 1823, and 1824, by Major Denham, Captain Clapperton, and the late Doctor Oudney, extending across the Great Desert to the Tenth Degree of Northern Latitude, and from Kouka in Bornou, to Sackatoo, the Capital of	

## CONTENTS.

<p>the Fellatah Empire. With an Appendix, published by Authority of the Right Honourable Earl Bathurst, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and Dedicated by Permission to his Lordship. By Major Dixon Denham, of his Majesty's 17th Regiment of Foot, and Captain Hugh Clapperton, of the Royal Navy, the Survivors of the Expedition . . . . .</p>	<p>173</p>
<p>VII. The Life and Remains of the Rev. Edward Daniel Clarke, LL. D., Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Cambridge . . . . .</p>	<p>219</p>

## CONTENTS OF NO. LXXXVIII.

---

	Page
ART. I. A System of Phrenology. By George Combe	253
II. Mr Jacob's Report on the Trade in Corn, and on the Agriculture of the North of Europe. Printed by Order of the House of Commons, 14th March 1826	319
III. Memoires de M. Falkenskiold, Officier-Général dans le Service de S. M. Danoise, à l'Epoque de la Catastro- phe du Comte de Struensee	360
IV. Narrative of the Surrender of Buonaparte, and of his Re- sidence on Board H. M. S. Bellerophon, with a detail of the Principal Events that occurred in that Ship, be- tween the 24th of May and 8th of August 1815. By Captain F. L. Maitland, C. B.	384
V. A Letter addressed to the Peers of Scotland. By Charles Lord Kinnaird	397
VI. 1. Lettres inedites de Madame de Maintenon à la Prin- cesse des Ursins.	
2. Memoires de M. Le Prince de Montbarey	413
VII. A Letter to the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Sur- rey, on the Misconduct of Licensing Magistrates, and the consequent Degradation of the Magistracy. By Thomas Edwards, LL.D.	441
VIII. 1. Parliamentary History and Review; containing Re- ports of the Proceedings of the Two Houses of Par- liament during the Session of 1825-6, Geo. IV.; with Critical Remarks on the principal Measures of the Session.	

# CONTENTS.

	Page
<b>ART. VIII. 2. Parliamentary Abstracts ; containing the Substance of all important Papers laid before the Two Houses of Parliament during the Session of 1825</b>	- 458
<b>IX. Letters on the Church. By an Episcopalian</b>	- 490
Notes and Additions to former Articles	- - 513
Index	- - - 517

---

## ERRATA.

- Page 2, line 12, *for* 'natural' *read* 'national.'
- 3, — 21 of Note, *for* 'Laureen,' *read* 'Lauzun.'
- penult line of Note, *for* 'calling,' *read* 'cutting.'
- 16, Note, *for* '20,' *read* '18.'
- 23, line 23, *for* 'select,' *read* 'secret.'
- 26, — 18, *delc* 'so large.'
- , — 38, *for* 'Bukeley,' *read* 'Berkeley.'
- 27, The two last references in the Notes have exchanged places.
- 29, line 40, *for* 'this,' *read* 'the.'
- 31, — 14, *for* 'Sir J.,' *read* 'Sir T.'
- 34, penult line, *for* 'regret,' *read* 'reject.'
- 269, line 19, *for* 'the,' *read* 'two.'
- 273, — 18, *for* 'irrisistability,' *read* 'irritability.'
- 283, — 20 from bottom, *for* 'the,' *read* 'no.'
- 316, — 6 from bottom (Note), *for* 'faculty,' *read* 'organ.'

# EDINBURGH REVIEW,

JUNE, 1826.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. LXXXVII.

---

ART. I. *Who Wrote Icon Basilike?* By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D. Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. London, 1824.

A SUCCESSION of problems or puzzles in the literary and political history of modern times, has occasionally occupied some ingenious writers, and amused many idle readers. Those who think nothing useful which does not yield some palpable and direct advantage, have indeed scornfully rejected such inquiries, as frivolous and useless. But their disdain has not repressed such discussions—and it is fortunate that it has not. Amusement is itself an advantage. The vigour which the understanding derives from exercise on every subject, is a great advantage. If there be any utility in history, it must be very useful that it should be accurate—which it never will be, unless there be a solicitude to ascertain the truth even of its minutest parts. History is read with pleasure, and with moral effect, only so far as it engages our feelings in the merit or demerit, in the fame or fortune, of historical personages. If it did not excite such feelings, we should study it with the same coolness and tranquillity with which we study physical science. But in contemplating the fortunes of our fellow-creatures, in history, in fiction, or in real life, we are eager, we are intensely anxious to discover the guilt or innocence, the claims to eminence, or the events of the lives of those whose characters have excited in our minds strong feelings, whether friendly or adverse. Our interest in the history of past times is of the same nature with our sentiments on the matters that daily occur around us. The breathless anxiety with which the obscure and conflicting evidence on a trial at law is watched by the bystanders, is but a variety of the same feeling which prompts the reader of history to examine the proofs against Mary Queen of Scots, with as deep an interest as if she were alive, and were now on her trial. And it is wisely ordered



that it should be so—For the condition of mankind would not, upon the whole, be bettered, by our feeling less strongly about each other's concerns.

Among these problems, a few of the most remarkable are—Who wrote the Book which bears the name of Thomas a Kempis? Who was Perkin Warbeck? Was Queen Mary an accomplice in the murder of Lord Darnley? Who was the Prisoner in the Iron Mask? Who was the writer of the Whole Duty of Man? Who wrote the Letters of Junius? Who wrote Icon Basilike?

The first and most voluminous of these disputes, which was carried on as a natural contest between France, Italy, and the Netherlands, from the beginning of the sixteenth to the beginning of the eighteenth century, \* ended in a general conviction that the author of the book '*De Imitatione Christi*'—a book which, for three hundred years, has continued to be the favourite companion of devotional readers of all communions and opinions—was Thomas a Kempis, a monk of Zwoll in Overysse, memorable as the first restorer of literature in the North of Europe, whose scholar Hegius was the preceptor of Erasmus. †

The legitimacy of Perkin Warbeck is a mere freak of paradoxical ingenuity. There would be no historical certainty remaining, if it were possible to disbelieve such a contemporary witness as Sir Thomas More.

The participation of Queen Mary in the murder of her husband, is an historical fact, which never would have been disputed, if her unparalleled reverses of fortune, the barbarity of her execution, ‡ and the magnanimity with which she suffered and died, had not enabled her Catholic and Jacobite advocates to entice the generous sympathies of mankind into their service.

The problem of the Man with the Iron Mask seems to have been solved within these few months. § All the official docu-

\* Gerson. Opera, vol. i. Dissert. de Dupin.

† Jortin's Erasmus, I. 2. Eich. Gesch. Lit. iii. 883.

‡ '*OCCISA, FEMINÆ IMPERIO, FEMINA ET COGNATA ET SUPPLEX ET REGINA!*'—*Grotii Histor. de Reb. Belg.* Lib. XII.

§ Delort, Histoire de l'Homme au Masque de Fer. Paris 1825. Since the text was written, we have seen the English volume of Mr Agar Ellis, who has substituted a very agreeable and interesting narrative of this remarkable incident, extracted from the authentic documents, for the obscure and confused tale of Delort; and, from the stores of his own historical knowledge, has thrown a clear light on every circumstance of the transaction. In one opinion we differ from him. He attributes the extraordinary precautions for the con-

ments respecting him have been published at Paris; from which it now appears, that the prisoner was Ercole Matthioli, prime minister of the Duke of Mantua, who, having been bribed by Louis XIV. to sell the fortress of Casal to that monarch, in order to open Piedmont and Lombardy to the French armies, afterwards betrayed the secret to the Courts of Vienna and Turin, by whom he appears to have been bought off; which, being discovered by new bribery and treachery, he was inveigled by D'Estrades to a place near the frontiers of Dauphiné, and seized at that place by a party of dragoons under Catinat, who brought him prisoner to the fortress of Pignerol, where he was committed to the custody of St Mars, whom he followed in the successive governments of Exiles, the Isles St Marguerite and the Bastile, in which last prison Matthioli died in 1703, after an imprisonment of thirty-four years. The story is thus deprived of the romantic character which

concealment of Matthioli, to an anxiety on the part of Louis XIV. that such a breach of the law of nations as the imprisonment of a minister plenipotentiary, should remain concealed. But, 1st, It is impossible that the sudden disappearance of Matthioli and his valet, after conferences with French agents, and on the frontiers of France, should not have excited the strongest suspicions of the truth, especially among those who knew the offence given by the Mantuan minister to Louis. 2d, The imprisonment of a Mantuan secretary at Pignerol did transpire, and was published in a periodical work, printed at Leyden in August 1687, (Ellis, 348), in which it is mentioned, that the prisoner was then at the Isles St Marguerite. In that age of slow circulation of news, the event must have been long known to all Courts before it could have reached a Dutch journalist. 3d, It seems improbable that Louis, at the moment of his highest power and insolence, should have dreaded the effect of a mere precedent, in the case of a petty and almost nominal sovereign. 4th, This improbability is increased by the well known fact, that he caused several persons to be seized and brought away prisoners from the territory of so powerful a State as the United Provinces, with scarcely any affectation of secrecy. 5th, Some precautions appear to have been used at Pignerol towards Fouquet and Laureen, whose imprisonment was no breach of international law, although a flagrant violation of humanity and justice.—The truth seems rather to be, that such precautions were then a part of the ferocious code of all absolute monarchies in the case of state prisoners. That interruption of all intercourse with the external world, which could not be completely insured without concealing the place of imprisonment, and even the existence of the prisoner, was considered both as a part of the punishment, and as the means of calling off the possibility of rescue or escape.

other explanations had given to it: But it is a new instance of the execrable policy with which Louis XIV. employed his ambassadors in sowing corruption and division among neighbours, under the mask of friendship, and in times of profound peace. A letter of Louvois to St Mars, dated 15th May 1679, is perhaps an unparalleled instance of explicit injunctions in writing, from a sovereign to his officer, to treat his prisoner with cruelty. ‘The intention of the King is *not* that the prisoner be well treated! His Majesty does not wish, that, except the necessities of life, any thing should be given him to make him pass it agreeably!’ The whole treatment of Matthioli appears to have flowed from revenge against an obscure individual: For the fortress of Casal was actually bought and received from the Duke of Mantua in 1681, only two years after Matthioli’s arrest; and as the imprisonment was secret, it could have had no effect in intimidating other ministers by the example. As the letters of the Dutchess of Orleans throw open the gross and coarse depravity of the court, which has so long enjoyed an undeserved reputation for refinement, so the history of the Iron Mask exemplifies the falsehood of Louis XIV., his contempt for the independence of nations, his treachery to absolute princes themselves, and his personal, deliberate, dark, and unrelenting cruelty to the victims of his ambition and revenge.

It is peculiar to the question of the authorship of the *Whole Duty of Man*, that even the sex of the writer is disputed. It is a question, whether it was written by a Dean of Christ Church, or by a Baronet’s lady in Worcestershire. The methodical and even systematic spirit; the calmness approaching to coldness; the precision, clearness, and elegant correctness of diction, which run through all the tracts of the writer, neither correspond to the education of women in that age, nor to their susceptible feelings at any time. Yet, in the long and able preface to that collection of tracts, in which the author is spoken of in the third person, much labour and skill are employed in avoiding the natural and usual employment of the personal pronouns, either of which must have referred exclusively to one sex. The writer of the Preface (*Dr Fell*) was therefore certainly desirous that his readers should ascribe the Tracts to a woman: \* and it is hard to conceive any motive for this wish but a repugnance to deceit. †

\* Works of the Author of the *Whole Duty of Man*. Oxford, 1726.

† It appears to be certain from the testimony of the very learned Dr Hickee, in the Dedication of his *Anglo-Saxon Grammar* to Sir John Pakington, that Dorothy Lady Pakinton, the daughter of Lord Keeper Coventry, was the writer of the *Whole Duty of Man*, if not

The writer of the Letters of Junius is still undiscovered. The only claim entitled to discussion, is that set up for Sir Philip Francis, in spite of that gentleman himself, by Mr Taylor, in the very ingenious book, too boldly entitled 'Junius Identified.' From that book, especially from the interest taken by Junius in the petty intrigues of the War Office, and from the coincidence of the artificial handwriting of Junius with the artificial handwriting of Sir Philip, in the possession of Mr Giles, we may probably infer, that Sir P. was in the confidence of Junius, and perhaps his amanuensis. The supposition however most prevalent among contemporary politicians and men of letters was, that the Letters were written by Mr Dyer, an original member of Johnson's Club, and an intimate friend of Burke, from whom the writer might have received some of his information, perhaps casually; and from whose conversation the few but striking *Burkisms*, so much at variance with the general tenor of the style, might have overflowed into the mind of Dyer, and almost insensibly dropped from his pen. A simple test ascertains the *political connexion* of Junius,—the only circumstance which he could not disguise, because it could not be concealed without defeating his general purpose. He supported the cause of authority against America,—with Mr Grenville, the minister who passed the Stamp Act. He maintained the highest popular principles on the Middlesex Election,—with the same statesman, who was the leader of opposition on that question. No other party in the kingdom but the Grenvilles combined these two opinions; and it is very unlikely that a private writer, unpledged and unconnected, should have spontaneously embraced political doctrines, which, though ingenuity might reconcile them in rea-

---

of all the Tracts published as the works of the same author. \* The manuscript is said to be still extant in the hands of the family. As some of the Tracts were published before the Restoration, the writer deserves to be numbered with Cowley, as one of the earliest purifiers of English style from pedantry. After the lapse of a hundred and seventy years, they contain scarcely a word or a phrase which has become superannuated. Other female writings there doubtless are, which please more permanently, partly because they more display the graceful talents of the sex; but it would be hard to name a large volume written by a woman in any language, which contains so equable and uniformly sustained an exhibition of the order, knowledge, vigorous sense, and mature taste, which are supposed to be masculine endowments.

---

\* Ballard's Learned Ladies, 316.

soning, were, in the disputes of that period, the opposite extremes. Whoever revives the inquiry, therefore, unless he discovers positive and irresistible evidence in support of his claimant, should show him to be politically attached to the Grenville party, which Junius certainly was, and must also produce some specimens of his writings of tolerable length, such as might afford reasonable ground for believing that he could have written these Letters—which must be allowed to be finished models, though not of the purest and highest sort of composition. The general vigour of a man's mental powers affords little more proof that he could be a good writer, than that he could be a great painter. There may indeed be evidence so positive as will establish the truth of the supposition which appeared most improbable—as has actually happened in the case of the Iron Mask. But such possibilities must exist in all moral reasonings. \*

The question, 'Who wrote *Icon Basilike*?' seemed more than once to be finally determined. Before the publication of the

---

\* It is not to be understood that other persons may not have held opinions adverse to the cause of the Americans, and favourable to that of Wilkes. The value of the criterion depends on the improbability, that, on the two most important questions which occurred for ten years, a writer of great ability should zealously, frequently, and for a long period, write in support of the popular side on one, and of the unpopular on the other, unless he, or those whom he supported, had been pledged to these opposite opinions, by measures of so public and decisive a nature as to cut off all retreat. It may be observed also, that Junius, who is unfriendly to Lord Chatham in the beginning, loads that nobleman with panegyric after he was reconciled to Lord Temple and Mr Grenville. There did, and perhaps there still does exist, a private letter from Junius to Mr Grenville, professing political attachment, and at the same time discouraging all attempts to pluck off his mask. Wilkes was originally Member for Aylesbury, and Lieutenant-Colonel of the Bucks Militia, under Lord Temple. Hence the extravagantly disproportioned interest taken by Junius in any petty intrigue of aldermen and sheriffs which touched that celebrated adventurer. Though a few letters were written after the death of Mr Grenville, yet to that event and the dissolution of his party, the cessation of Junius is to be attributed. In these circumstances, and others not yet publicly known, originated the supposition that Mr Lloyd was Junius. But some specimen of his writing is wanting to countenance that supposition. In the cases of Dyer and Francis, the two candidates of most plausible pretension, no proof has hitherto appeared of connexion with the Grenville party. Some resemblance of style in Francis is a very inconsiderable argument; for almost every contributor to a newspaper, during the twenty years which followed the Letters, was an imitator of Junius.

private letters of Gauden, the majority of historical inquirers had pronounced it to be spurious: and the only writers of great acuteness who maintained its genuineness—Warburton and Hume—spoke in a tone which rather indicated an anxious desire that others should believe, than a firm belief in their own minds. It is perhaps the only matter on which the former ever expressed himself with diffidence. \* The case must indeed have seemed doubtful, which compelled the most dogmatical and arrogant of disputants to adopt a language almost sceptical. It must be owned that he did not, like Hume, consider the events of Charles the First's reign with the spirit of a thorough-paced Tory. Had he professed the opinions on that subject which are now in vogue, he could not have been patronized by the Yorkes of that time; nor is it likely that all the influence of Mr Allen over the election at Bath, would have induced the Mr Pitt of 1759 to raise him even to the bishopric of Gloucester. But as a compensation for his occasional conformity to Whiggism in matters of state, it must be allowed that he retained the dislike of a bishop, and the hatred of a controversialist, towards ecclesiastical nonconformists. His conviction therefore must have been faint, when he asserts it so moderately against a Presbyterian minister—the historian of nonconformity.

The successive publications of the letters in which Gauden laid claim to the *Icon*—in *Maty's Review*—in the third volume of the *Clarendon Papers*—and last, but most decisively, by Mr Todd, seemed to have closed the dispute. Dr Wordsworth has, however, revived it in the volume before us; and as he in some measure ascribes this revival to a passage in the *Edinburgh Review* of Sir George Mackenzie's *Historical Fragment* on the reign of Charles II., † the writer of that review may be thought to be called upon to answer for the opinion which he there delivered.

It is natural that the divines of the High Church party should be proud of a Royal Martyr for the Church—that they should zealously contend for whatever exalts his character—and that, like all other zealous advocates, they should often be blinded by their zeal. Dr Wordsworth is, however, generally a temperate and decorous controversialist; though there be two passages ‡ towards the end, in which, while celebrating

\* Warburton's Works, vii. 920. Notes on Neale's History.

† Edin. Rev. October 1821.

‡ 'Truth is seen linked in happy union with Piety and Royalty; ' as if they were constant, or at least general companions!—' Faction ' and Profaneness are found to lie under a curse; they are seen to ' have cherished a lie.' p. 412.

his imaginary triumph, he speaks of his opponents in a spirit, for which only the general temper of the book can make atonement. An advocate who finds the more conspicuous facts against him has no resource, but that of accumulating a multitude of minute, obscure, and separately trivial circumstances, the combination of which may give him at least the semblance of a tenable position. Dr Wordsworth, who fairly admits the force of the probabilities against the King's claim, \* is driven to the necessity of expanding the same little circumstances, which had been before brought together for the like purpose by Wagstaffe. † Nor is this accumulation without its effect. The unwary reader is apt to count arguments instead of weighing them, and to mistake a long line for a formidable force. The inexperienced disputant who should be tempted or provoked to follow Dr Wordsworth through his microscopic inspection of the particles and atoms of probability, would inevitably be worsted in some points, which, however utterly impertinent in themselves, would give a delusive appearance of victory to the weaker cause, in the eyes of unknowing bystanders.

But the main questions on which the whole dispute hinges, is, whether the acts and words of LORD CLARENDON, of LORD BRISTOL, of BISHOP MORLEY, of CHARLES II. and JAMES II., do not amount to a distinct acknowledgment of Gauden's authorship, and whether an admission of that claim *by these persons* be not a conclusive evidence of its foundation in truth. If these questions can be answered affirmatively, the other parts of the case will not require very long consideration.

The *Icon Basilike* was intended to produce a favourable effect during the King's trial; but its publication was retarded till some days after his death, by the jealous and rigorous precautions of the ruling powers. The impression made on the public by a work, which purported to convey the pious and eloquent language of a dying King, could not fail to be very considerable; and, though its genuineness was from the beginning doubted or disbelieved by some, ‡ it would have been wonderful and unnatural if unbounded faith in it had not become one of the fundamental articles of a Royalist's creed. Though much stress

\* P. 12. 'Looking only to this side of this case, it would seem 'next to impossible but that Gauden, not Charles, was the author of '*Icon Basilike*.'

† Wagstaffe's *Vindication of King Charles the Martyr*. London, 1711. A good abridgement of Wagstaffe's Statement is to be found in Burton's *Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History*, 149-173.

‡ Milton, Goodwyn, Lilly, &c.

therefore, is laid by Dr Wordsworth \* on passages in anonymous pamphlets published before the Restoration, we can regard these as really no more than instances of the belief which must then have prevailed among that great majority of Royalists who had no peculiar reasons for doubt. Opinion, even when it is impartial, of the genuineness of a writing, given before its authenticity was seriously questioned, and when the attention of those who gave the opinion was not strongly drawn to the subject, must be classed in the lowest species of historical evidence. One witness who bears testimony to a forgery, when the edge of his discernment is sharpened by disputes, outweighs many whose language only indicates a passive acquiescence in the unexamined sentiments of their own party. It is obvious, indeed, that such testimonies must be of exceedingly little value; for every imposture, in any degree successful, *must* be able to appeal to them. Without them, no question on such a subject could ever be raised; since it would be idle to expose the spuriousness of what no one appeared to think authentic.

Dr Gauden, a divine of considerable talents, but of a temporizing and interested character, was, at the beginning of the Civil war, chaplain to the Earl of Warwick, a Presbyterian leader; and in November 1640, after the close imprisonment of Lord Strafford, preached a sermon before the House of Commons, so agreeable to that assembly, that it is said they presented him with a silver tankard; a token of their esteem which (if the story be true) may seem to be the stronger for its singularity and unseemliness.† His discourse seems to have contained a warm invective against the ecclesiastical policy of the Court; and it was preached not only at a most critical time, but on the solemn occasion of the sacrament being first taken by the whole House. As a reward for so conspicuous a service to the Parliamentary cause, he soon after received the valuable living of Bocking in Essex, which he held through all the succeeding changes of

\* See Wagst. 77-79.

† The Journals say nothing of the tankard, which was probably the gift of some zealous members, but bear, 'That the thanks of this House be given to Mr GAUDY and Mr Morley for their sermons last Sunday, and that they be desired, if they please, to print the same.' — *Com. Journ.* ii. 40. Sir J. Barrington undertook specially to deliver the thanks to Mr G. The name given to Gauden is connected with one of the smaller circumstances of this case. It is also to be remembered, that Mr Morley is probably the same person who was afterwards successively Bishop of Worcester and Winchester, and who was thought a favourer of the Puritans before the Civil war. (Kennett, 666, from Burnett.)



government, forbearing, of necessity, to use the Liturgy, and complying with all the conditions which the law then required from the beneficed clergy. It has been disputed whether he took the covenant, though his own evasive answers seem rather to confirm the opinion that he had. It may be true that he *wrote* a Protest against the trial of the King in 1648, though it is said not to have been published till 1662;\* but even if it was published at the useful time, it never could have pretended to the same merit with the solemn Declaration of the whole Presbyterian Clergy of London against the same proceeding, which however did not save them at the Restoration.

At the moment of the Restoration of Charles II., he appears therefore to have had as little *public* claim on the favour of that prince as any clergyman who had conformed to the ecclesiastical principles of the Parliament and the Protectorate; and he was accordingly long after called by zealous Royalists 'the false Apostate!' † Bishoprics were indeed offered to Baxter, who refused, and to Reynolds, who accepted, a mitre; but if they had not been, as they were, men venerable for every virtue, they were the acknowledged leaders of the Presbyterians, whose example might have much effect in disposing that powerful body to conformity. No such benefit could be hoped from the preferment of Gauden: and that his public character must have rendered him rather the object of disfavour than of patronage to the Court at this critical and jealous period, will be obvious to those who are conversant with one small, but not insignificant circumstance. The Presbyterian party is well known to have predominated in the Convention-Parliament, especially when it first assembled; and it was the policy of the whole assembly to give a Presbyterian, or moderate and mediatorial colour, to their collective proceedings. On the 25th April 1660, they chose Mr Calamy, Dr Gauden, and Mr Baxter, to preach before them, on the fast which they appointed to be held; thus placing Gauden between two eminent Divines of the Presbyterian persuasion, on an occasion when they appear studiously to have avoided the appointment of an Episcopalian. ‡ Even the length of time which must have been occupied by the sermons and prayers of three distinguished preachers, bore the stamp of the Presbyterian times. It is evident that *Gauden* was then thought nearer to Baxter than to Juxon. He was sufficiently a Presbyterian in party to make him no favourite with the Court. Yet he was not so decided a Presbyterian in

---

\* Biog. Brit. Art. Gauden.

† Barw. in Kenn. 773.

‡ Com. Journ. 25th April 1660. Baxter's Life of Himself, 217.

opinion as to have that influence among them which could make him worth so high a price as a mitre. Those who dispute his claim to be the writer of the Icon, will be the last to ascribe his preferment to transcendent abilities. He is not mentioned as having ever shown kindness to Royalists; there is no trace of his correspondence with the exiled Court; he contributed nothing to the recall of the King, nor indeed had he the power of performing such atoning services.

Let the reader then suppose himself to be acquainted only with the above circumstances, and pause to consider whether, in the summer of 1660, there could be many clergymen of the Established Church who had fewer and more scanty pretensions to a bishopric than Gauden. He was appointed Bishop of Exeter, however, on the 3d of November 1660! He received, in a few months, 20,000*l.* in fines for the renewal of leases.\* And yet he had scarcely arrived at his Episcopal palace when, on the 21st of December, he wrote a letter to the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, † bitterly complaining of the ‘distress, infelicitous city and horror,’ of such a bishopric! ‘a hard fate which’ (he reminds the Chancellor) he ‘had before deprecated.’

‘I make this complaint’ (he adds) ‘to your Lordship, because you chiefly put me on this adventure. You commanded me to trust to your favour for such additional support as might supply the defects of the bishopric.’—‘*I am not so unconscious to the service done to the Church and to his Majesty’s family, as to bear with patience the ruin heaped upon me. Are these the effects of his liberal expressions, who told me I might have what I would desire?*’—‘If you will not concern yourself in my affairs, I must make my last complaint to his Majesty.’ ‡

In five days after (26th December 1660,) he wrote another long letter, less angry and more melancholy, to the same great person, which contains the following remarkable sentence.

‘Dr Morley once offered me *my option, upon account of some service which he thought I had done extraordinary for the Church and Royal Family, of which he told me your Lordship was informed.* This made me modestly secure of your Lordship’s favour; though I found you would never own your consciousness to me, as if it would give me too much confidence.’—‘I knew your Lordship knew my service and merit to be no way inferior to the best of *your friends, or enemies.*’ §

In these two letters, more covertly in the first, more openly in the second, Gauden apprises Lord Clarendon, that Dr Mor-

\* Biog. Brit. and Authorities there cited.

† Words. Docum. App. 8.

‡ *i. e.* Royalists recompensed, or Presbyterians gained over.

§ Doc. App. 11—13.

ley (who was Clarendon's most intimate friend) had acknowledged some *extraordinary service* done by Gauden to the Royal Family, which had been made known to the Chancellor; though that nobleman avoided a direct acknowledgment of it to G. before the Bishop left London. Gauden appears soon after to have written to Sir E. Nicholas, Secretary of State, a letter of so peculiar a character as to be read by the King; for an answer was sent to him by Nicholas, dated on the 19th January 1661, in which the following sentence deserves attention.

'As for your own particular, he desires you not to be discouraged at the poverty of your Bishopric at present; and if that answer not the expense that was promised you, HIS MAJESTY WILL TAKE YOU SO PARTICULARLY INTO HIS CARE, that he bids me to assure you shall have no cause to remember Bocking.' \*

These remarkable words by no means imply that Gauden did not then believe the nature of his 'extraordinary service,' to be before known to the King. They evidently show his letter to have consisted of a complaint of the poverty of his bishopric, with an intelligible allusion to this service, probably expressed with more caution and reserve than in his addresses to the Chancellor. What was really then first made known to the King was not his merits, but his poverty. On the 21st January, the importunate prelate again addressed to Clarendon a letter, explicitly stating the nature of his services, probably rendered necessary in his opinion by the continued silence of Clarendon, (who it should seem) did not answer his applications till the 13th March 1661. From this letter the following extract is inserted.

'All I desire is an augment of 500*l.* per annum, y<sup>t</sup> if cannot bee at present had in a meemdam, yet possibly the King's favor to me will not grudge mee this pension out of the first fruits and tenths of this diocese, till I bee removed or otherwayes provided for. Nor will y<sup>r</sup> Lordship startle at this motion, or wave the presenting of it to his Majesty, yf you please to consider the pretentions I may have BEYOND ANY OF MY CALLING, not as to merit, but duty performed TO THE ROYALL FAMILY. True, I once presumed y<sup>r</sup> Lordship had fully known that arcanum, for so Dr Morley told mee, at the King's first coming; when he assured me the greatnes of that service was such, that I might have any preferment I desired.† This consciousness of y<sup>r</sup> Lordship (as I supposed) and Dr Morley, made mee confident my affaires would bee carried on to some proportion of what I had done, and he thought deserved. Hence my silence of it to y<sup>r</sup> Lordship: as to the King and Duke of York, whom before I came away I acquainted with it, when I saw myself not so much considered in my present disposition as I did hope I should have bene, what trace their Royall goodnes hath of it is best expressed by themselves; nor do I doubt but I shall, by y<sup>r</sup> Lordship's favor, find the fruits as to

\* Docum. Sup. 14.

† Twice mentioned in twenty-five days.

something extraordinary, since the service was soe; not as to what was known to the world under my name, in order to vindicate the Crowne and the Church, BUT WHAT GOES UNDER THE LATE BLESSED KING'S NAME, THE *εἰκὼν* OR PORTRAITURE OF HYS MAJESTY IN HYS SOLITUDES AND SUFFERINGS. THIS BOOK AND FIGURE WAS WHOLLY AND ONLY MY INVENTION, MAKING AND DESIGNE; IN ORDER TO VINDICATE THE KING'S WISDOME, HONOR AND PIETY. My wife indeed was conscious to it, and had an hand in DISGUIISING THE LETTERS OF THAT COPY WHICH I SENT TO THE KING IN THE ISLE OF WIGHT, by favor of the late Marquise of Hertford, which was delivered to the King by the \* now Bishop of Winchester: hys Majesty graciously accepted, owned, and adopted it as hys sense and genius; not only with great approbation, but admiration. Hee kept it with hym; and though hys cruel murderers went on to perfect hys martyrdome, yet God preserved and prospered this book to revive hys honor, and redeeme hys Majesty's name from that grave of contempt and abhorrence or infamy, in which they aymed to bring hym.

When it came out, just upon the King's death; Good God! what shame, rage and despite, filled hys murderers! What comfort hys friends! How many enemy's did it convert! How many hearts did it mollify and melt! What devotions it rayed to hys posterity, as children of such a father! What preparations it made in all men's minds for this nappy restauration, and which I hope shall not prove my affliction! In a word, it was an army, and did vanquish more than any sword could. My Lord, every good subject conceived hopes of restauration; meditated revenge and separation. Yr Lordship and all good subjects with hys Majesty enjoy the reall and now ripe fruites of that plant. O let not mee wither! who was the author, and ventured wife, children, estate, liberty, life, and all but my soule, in so great an atchievement, which hath filled England and all the world with the glory of it. I did lately present my fayth in it to the Duke of York, and by him to the King; both of them were pleased to give mee credit, and owne it as a rare service in those horrors of time. True, I played this best card in my hand something too late, else I might have sped as well as Dr Reynolds and some others; but I did not lay it as a ground of ambition, nor use it as a ladder. Thinking mysef secure in the just value of Dr Morely, who I was sure knew it, and told mee yr Lordship did soe too; † who, I believe, intended mee something at least competent, though less convenient, in this preferment. All that I desire is, that y' Lordship would make that good, which I think you designed, and which I am confident the King will not deny mee, agreeable to hys royall munificence, which promiseth extraordinary rewards to extraordinary services. Certainly this service is such, for the matter, manner, timing and effi-

---

\* Duppa.

† It is not to be inferred from this and the like passages, that G. doubted the previous communication of Morley to Clarendon. He uses such language as a reproach to the Chancellor for his silence.

cacy, as was never exceeded, nor will even be equalled, yf I may credit the judgment of the best and wisest men that have read it ; and I know y<sup>r</sup> Lordship, who is so great a master of wisdome and eloquence, cannot but esteem the author of that piece ; and accordingly, make mee to see those effects which may assure mee, that my loyalty, pains, care, hazrad and silence, are accepted by the King and Royall Family, to which y<sup>r</sup> Lordship's is now grafted.'

The Bishop wrote three letters more to Clarendon on the 25th January, 20th February, and 6th March. At last the Chancellor wrote a letter to him on the 13th March 1661, which is subjoined, and which evidently appears, by the apologies for delay, to be the first answer received by the Bishop.

March 13. 1661. The Lord Chancellor to the Bishop of Exter.

'MY LORD—I doe assure you upon my creditt all your letters make a deep impression on me, though it is not possible for me to acknowledge them particularly, as I ought to do, being not only oppressed with severe weight of business, but of late indisposed in my health. I am heartily gladd that wee are like shortly to meete and conferr together, and then I doubt not but that I shall appeare very faultless towards you, how unfortunate soever I have beene in contributing somewhat to your uneasincsse, which I was far from pressing upon you when I once founde the overture was unacceptable to you. I do well remember that I promised you to procure any good commendam to be annexed to that sea, which I heartily desyre to do, and longe for the opportunity ; and likewise that you should be removed nearer to this towne with the first occasion, for which undertaking I have likewise good authority : If the Bishops who have been made since the King's returne, feel no other content than from the money they have yet received from their revennew, I am sure all with whom I am acquainted are most miserable, they havinge not yett received wherewith to buy them breade. I shall be very gladd to finde when we meet, that it is in my power to contribute any thing to your Lordship's content. In the mean time, I do assure you I am more afflicted with you, and for you, than I can expresse ; and the more sensibly, that it is the only charge of that kind is laid upon me, which in truth I do not think I doe deceive. *The particular which you often renewed, I do confesse was imparted to me under secrecy, and of which I did not take myself to be at liberty to take notice ; \* and truly when it ceases to be a secret, I know nobody will be gladd of it but Mr Milton ; I have very often wished I had never been trusted with it.* My Lord, I have nothinge to enlarge ; all I have to say being fitter for conference than a letter ; and I hope shortly to see you, when you shall find me very ready to serve you, as my Lord,

Y<sup>r</sup> Lor<sup>ty</sup>'

Most affectionate Serv<sup>t</sup>,

EDW. HYDE, C.

---

\* Evidently by Morley,

It is proper here to remark, that all the letters of Gauden are still extant, indorsed by Lord Clarendon, or by his eldest son. In the course of three months then, it appears that Gauden, with unusual importunity and confidence, with complaints which were disguised reproaches, and sometimes with an approach to menaces, asserted his claim to be richly rewarded, AS THE AUTHOR OF THE ICON. He affirms that it was sent to the King by the Duke of Somerset, who died about a month before his first letter, and delivered to his Majesty by Dr Duppa, Bishop of Winchester, who was still alive. He adds, that he had acquainted Charles II. with the secret through the Duke of York, that Morley, then Bishop of Worcester, had informed Clarendon of it, and that Morley himself had declared the value of the service to be such, as to entitle Gauden to choose his own preferment. Gauden thus enabled Clarendon to convict him of falsehood (if his tale was untrue) in three or four circumstances, differing indeed in their importance as to the main question, but equally material to his own veracity. A single word from Duppa would have overwhelmed him with infamy. Some of the communications were made before the Duke of Somerset's death, on the 24th of October. \* How easy was it for the Chancellor to ascertain whether the information had been given to the King and his brother ! Morley was his bosom-friend, and the spiritual director of his daughter, Anne Dutchess of York. How many other persons might have been quietly sounded by the numerous confidential agents of a great minister, on a transaction which had occurred only twelve years before ! To suppose that a statesman, then at the zenith of his greatness, could not discover the truth on this subject, without a noise like that of a judicial inquiry, would betray a singular ignorance of affairs. Did Clarendon relinquish, without a struggle, his belief in a book, which had doubtless touched his feelings when he read it as the work of his Royal Master ? Even curiosity might have led Charles II., when receiving the blessing of Duppa on his deathbed, to ask him a short confidential question. To how many chances of detection did Gauden expose himself ? How nearly impossible is it that the King, the Duke, the Chancellor and Morley, should have abstained from the safest means of inquiry, and in opposition to their former opinions and prejudices, yielded at once to Gauden's assertion, without any evidence of its truth !

The previous belief of the Royalist party in the *Icon* very much

---

\* This is overlooked by Dr W. Doc. Supr. 23.

magnifies the improbability of such suppositions. The truth might be discovered by the parties appealed to, and conveyed to the audacious pretender, without any scandal. There was no need of any public exposure. A private intimation of the falsehood of one material circumstance must have silenced Gauden. But what, on the contrary, is the answer of Lord Clarendon? Let any reader consider the penult sentence of his letter, and determine for himself whether it does not express such an unhesitating assent to the claim as could only have flowed from inquiry and evidence. By confessing that the secret was imparted to him, he admits the other material part of Gauden's statement, that the information came through Morley.\* It may be remarked, that Gauden, if his story was true, chose the persons to whom he imparted it both prudently and fairly. He dealt with it as a secret of which the disclosure would injure the Royal cause; and he therefore confined his communications to the King's sons and the Chancellor, who could not be indisposed to the cause by it, and whose knowledge of it was necessary to justify his own legitimate claims. Had it been false, no choice could have been more unfortunate. He appealed to those who, for aught he knew, might have in their possession the means of instantly demonstrating that he was guilty of a falsehood so impudent and perilous, that nothing parallel to it has ever been hazarded by a man of sound mind. How could Gauden know that the King did not possess his fathers MS., and that Royston the printer was not ready to prove that he had received it from Charles I., through hands totally unconnected with Gauden? How great must have been the risk if we suppose with Dr W. and Mr Wagstaffe, that more than one copy of the MS. existed, and that parts of it had been seen by many? It is without any reason that Dr W. and others represent the *secrecy* of Gauden's communications to Clarendon as a circumstance of suspicion; for he was surely bound, by that sinister honour which prevails in the least moral confederacies, to make no needless disclosures on this delicate subject.

Clarendon's letter is a declaration that he was *converted* from his former opinion about the author of the Icon. That of Sir E. Nicholas is a declaration to the same purport on his own part, and on that of the King. The confession of Clarendon is more important, from being apparently wrung from him, after the lapse of a considerable time: in the first part of which he evaded acknowledgment in conversation, while in the latter part he incurred the blame of incivility, by delaying to answer

letters; making his admission at last in the hurried manner of an unwilling witness. The decisive words, however, were at length extorted from him, 'WHEN IT CEASES TO BE A SECRET, I KNOW NOBODY WILL BE GLAD OF IT, BUT MR MILTON.' Wagstaffe argues this question as if Gauden's letters were to be considered as a man's assertions in his own cause; without appearing ever to have made the very obvious observation, that they are not offered as proof of the facts which they affirm, but as a claim which circumstances show to have been recognised by the adverse party.

The course of another year did not abate the solicitations of Gauden. In the end of 1661 and beginning of 1662, the infirmities of Duppa promised a speedy vacancy in the great Bishopric of Winchester, to which Gauden did not fail to urge his pretensions with undiminished confidence, in a letter to the Chancellor, (28th December 1661), in a letter to the Duke of York, (17th January 1662), and in a memorial to the King, without a date, but written on the same occasion. The two letters allude to the particulars of former communications. The memorial, as the nature of such a paper required, is fuller and more minute: it is expressly founded on 'a private service,' for the reality of which it again appeals to the declarations of Morley, to the evidence of Duppa, ('who (says Gauden) encouraged me in that great work,') still alive, and visited on his sick-bed by the King; and to the testimony of the Duke of Somerset, who, though he died on the 24th of October 1660, must have lived two or three months after Gauden's first communication to the King, which is fixed by the memorial to have been before the King's Speech to Parliament on the 13th of September 1660: \* 'For,' says Gauden, soon after (his con-

---

\* Doc. Supp. 30. We have no positive proof that these two letters were sent, or the memorial delivered. It seems (Doc. Sup. 27.) that there are marks of the letters having been sealed and broken open; and it is said to be singular that such letters should be found among the papers of him who wrote them. But as the early history of these papers is unknown, it is impossible to expect an explanation of every fact. A collector might have found them elsewhere, and added them to the Gauden papers. An anxious writer might have broken open two important letters, in which he was fearful that some expression was indiscreet, and afterwards sent corrected duplicates, without material variation. Gauden might have received information respecting the disposal of Winchester and Worcester, or about the state of parties at Court, before the letters were dispatched, which would render them then unseasonable. What is evident is, that they were written



versation with Morley), 'I acquainted your Majesty through ' the Duke of York's mediation; *after this*, your Majesty told ' the world, that nothing became Kingly Majestie more than ' to requite extraordinary services with extraordinary rewards'—words which were used by Charles in that speech. To this memorial we owe the important information, that the first claim was made when there was time and opportunity to consult the Duke of Somerset, who thus becomes a witness in support of Gauden's pretensions. It also shows that Gauden had applied to the King for Winchester as soon as it should become vacant, about or before the time of his appointment to Exeter.

On the 19th of March 1662, it appears that Gauden was complimented at Court as the author of the *Icon*, by George Digby, second Earl of Bristol, a nobleman of fine genius and brilliant accomplishments, but remarkable for his inconstancy in political and religious opinion. The bond of connexion between him and Gauden seems to have been their common principles of toleration, which Bristol was solicitous to obtain for the Catholics, whom he had secretly joined; and which Gauden was willing to grant, not only to the Old Nonconformists, but to the more obnoxious Quakers. On the day following (20th March) Gauden wrote a letter to him, in which it is supposed that 'the Grand Arcanum' was disclosed to him 'by the King or the Royal Duke.' In six days after he writes again, on the death of Duppa, to urge his claim to Winchester. His third letter (27th March) to the same person is more important. He observes, with justice, that he could not expect 'any extraordinary instance of ' his Majesty's favour on account of his signal service only, because that might put the world on a dangerous curiosity if he ' had been in other respects unobtrusive;' but he adds, in effect, that his public services would be a sufficient reason or pretext for the great preferment to which he aspired. He appeals to a new witness on the subject of the *Icon*, Dr Sheldon, then Bishop of London,—thus, once more, if his story were untrue, almost wantonly adding to the chance of easy, immediate, and private detection. His danger had indeed been already enhanced by the disclosure of the secret to Lord Bristol, who was very intimately acquainted with Charles I., and among whose

---

with an intention to send them; that they coincide with his previous statements; and that *the determination not to send them was not occasioned by any doubts entertained by the Chancellor of his veracity; for such doubts would have prevented his preferment to the Bishopric of Worcester*—one of the most coveted dignities of the Church.

good qualities discretion and circumspection cannot be numbered. The belief of Bristol must also be considered as a proof that Gauden continued to be believed by the King and the Duke, from whom Bristol's information proceeded. A friendly correspondence, between the Bishop and the Earl, continued till near the death of the former, in the autumn 1662.

In the mean time, the Chancellor gave a still more decisive proof of his continued conviction of the justice of Gauden's pretensions, by the translation of that Prelate to Worcester in May 1662. The Chancellor's personal ascendant over the King was perhaps then somewhat impaired; But his power was still unshaken; and he was assuredly the effective as well as formal adviser of the Crown on ecclesiastical promotions. The open rupture between him and Lord Bristol did not occur till the ensuing year. But it would be the grossest injustice to the memory of Lord Clarendon to believe it possible, that if, after two years' opportunity for inquiry, any serious doubts of Gauden's veracity had remained in his mind, he would have still farther honoured and exalted the contriver of a falsehood, devised for mercenary purposes, to rob an unhappy and beloved Sovereign of that power which, by his writings, he still exercised over the generous feelings of men. It cannot be doubted, and ought not to be forgotten, that a false claim to the *Icon* is a crime of a far deeper dye than the publication of it under the false appearance of a work of the King. To publish such a book in order to save the King's life, was an offence, attended by circumstances of much extenuation, in one who believed, or perhaps knew, that it substantially contained the King's sentiments, and who deeply deprecated the proceedings of the army and of the remnant of the House of Commons against him. But to usurp the reputation of the work so long after the death of the Royal Author, for sheer lucre, is an act of baseness perhaps without a parallel. That Clarendon should wish to leave the more venial deception undisturbed, and even shrink from such refusals as might lead to its discovery, is not far beyond the limits which good men may overstep in very difficult situations. But that he should reward the most odious of impostors by a second bishopric, would place him far lower than a just adversary would desire. If these considerations seem of such moment at this distant time, what must have been their force in the years 1660 and 1662, in the minds of Clarendon, and Somerset, and Duppa, and Morley, and Sheldon? It was very easy to have avoided the elevation of Gauden to Worcester. He had himself opened the way for offering him a pension; and

the Chancellor might have answered almost in Gauden's own words, that farther preferment might lead to perilous inquiry. Clarendon, in 1662, must either have doubted who was the author of the *Icon*, or believed the claim of Gauden, or adhered to his original opinion. If he believed it to be the work of the King, he could not have been so unfaithful to his memory as to raise such an impostor to a second bishopric. If he believed it to be the production of Gauden, he might have thought it an excusable policy to recompense a pious fraud, and to silence the possessor of a dangerous secret. If he had doubts, they would have prompted him to investigation, which, conducted by him, and relating to transactions so recent, must have terminated in certain knowledge.

Charles II. is well known, at the famous conference between the Episcopalians and Presbyterians, when the *Icon* was quoted as his father's, to have said, 'All that is in that book is not gospel.' Knowing as we now do, that Gauden's claim was preferred to him in 1660, this answer must be understood to have been a familiar way of expressing his scepticism about its authenticity. In this view of it, it coincides with his declaration to Lord Anglesea twelve years after; and it is natural indeed to suppose, that his opinion was that of those whom he then most trusted on such matters, of whom Clarendon was certainly one. To suppose, with some late writers, that he and his brother looked with favour and pleasure on an attempt to weaken the general interest in the character of their father, merely because the *Icon* is friendly to the Church of England, is a wanton act of injustice to them and to their not undeservedly unfortunate family, whose reigns are very little marked by those domestic animosities which frequently disturb the palace. Charles II. was neither a bigot, nor without regard to his kindred. The family affections of James were his best qualities,—though, by a peculiar perverseness of fortune, they proved the source of his sharpest pangs.

But to return to Lord Clarendon, who survived Gauden twelve years, and who, almost to the last day of his life, was employed in the composition of an historical work, originally undertaken at the desire of Charles I., and avowed, with honest partiality, to be destined for the vindication of his character and cause. This great work, not intended for publication in the age of the writer, was not actually published till thirty years after his death; and even then not without the suppression of important passages, which it seems the public was not yet likely to receive in a proper temper. Now, neither in the original edition, nor in any of the recently restored passages, is there

any allusion to the supposed Work of the King.\* No reason of temporary policy can account for this extraordinary silence. However the statesman might be excused for the momentary sacrifice of truth to quiet, the historian could have no temptation to make the sacrifice perpetual. Had he believed that his Royal Master was the writer of the only book ever written by a dying monarch on his own misfortunes, it would have been unjust as an historian, treacherous as a friend, and unfeeling as a man, to have passed over in silence such a memorable and affecting circumstance. Merely as a fact, his narrative was defective without it. But it was a fact of a very touching and interesting nature, on which his genius would have expatiated with affectionate delight. No later historian of the Royal party has failed to dwell on it. How should he then whom it must have most affected be silent, unless his pen had been stopped by the knowledge of the truth? He had even personal inducements to explain it, at least in those more private memoirs of his administration, which form part of what is called his Life. Had he believed in the genuineness of the Icon, it would have been natural for him in these memoirs to have reconciled that belief with the successive preferments of the impostor. He had good reason to believe that the claims of Gauden would one day reach the public; he had himself, in his remarkable letter of March 1661, spoken of such a disclosure as likely; his own acknowledgment contained in that letter, which he knew to be in the possession of Gauden's family, increased the probability. It was scarcely possible that such papers should for ever elude the search of curiosity, of historical justice, or of party spirit. But besides these probabilities, Clarendon, a few months before his death, *'had learned that ill people endeavoured to persuade the King that his father was not the author of the book that goes by his name.'*† This information was conveyed to him from Bishop Morley through Lord Cornbury, who went to visit his father in France in May 1674. On hearing these words, Clarendon exclaimed, *'Good God! I thought the Marquis of Hertford had satisfied the King in that matter.'* By this message Clarendon was therefore warned, that the claim of Gauden was

---

\* See the new edition, Oxford, 1826.

† Who wrote Icon, &c. 103. Wagst. 46. The first letter of the second Earl of Clarendon to Wagstaffe in 1694, about twenty years after the event, has not, as far as we know, been published. We know only the extracts in Wagstaffe. The second letter, written in 1699, is printed entire in *Wagstaffe's Defense*, 37.

on its way to the public; that it was already assented to by the Royal Family themselves, and was likely at last to appear with the support of the most formidable authorities. What could he now conclude but that, if undetected and unrefuted, or, still more, if uncontradicted in a history destined to vindicate the King, the claim would be considered by posterity as established by his silence? Clarendon's language on this occasion also strengthens very much another part of the evidence; for it proves beyond all doubt, that the authorship of the *Icon had been discussed by the King with the Duke of Somerset before that nobleman's death in October 1660*; a fact nearly conclusive of the whole question:—for had he assured the King that his father was the author, what a conclusive answer was ready to Gauden, who asserted that noble person to have been the bearer of the manuscript of the *Icon* from Gauden to Charles I.!—As there had been such a communication between the King and the Duke of Somerset, it is altogether incredible that Clarendon should not have recurred to the same pure source of information. The only admissible meaning of Clarendon's words is, that ‘*Lord Hertford* (afterwards Duke of Somerset) *had satisfied the King*’ of the impropriety of speaking on the subject.\* We must otherwise suppose that the King and Clarendon had been ‘satisfied,’ or perfectly convinced that Charles was the writer of the *Icon*; a supposition which would convert the silence of the Chancellor and the levity of the Monarch into heinous offences. Morley and Clarendon sent a message and answer in a *cipher*;—of course unintelligible to Lord Cornbury, because they covered a secret which they were both bound to conceal from all men. The comparison of these messages with Gauden's letters, is alone sufficient to decide this controversy. The message of Morley to Clarendon demonstrates that they had previous conversation on the subject. The answer of Clarendon shows that both parties knew of information respecting it having been given by Somerset to the King, before Gauden's nomination to Exeter. But Gauden had at that time appealed, in his letters, both to Morley and Somerset as his witnesses. That Clarendon therefore knew all that Morley and Somerset could tell, is no longer matter of inference, but is established by the positive testimony of the two survivors in 1674. Wagstaffe did not perceive the consequences of the Letter which he published, because he had not seen

---

\* Dr W. says, that no man living whose judgment is worth a straw will adopt the above construction. He does not seem to perceive how near this assertion is to an assumption of the whole matter in dispute,

the whole correspondence of Gauden. But it is much less easy to understand, how those who have compared the letters of Gauden with the messages between Clarendon and Morley, should not have discovered the irresistible inference which arises from the comparison.

The silence of Lord Clarendon, as an historian, is the strongest moral evidence that he believed the pretensions of Bishop Gauden: And his opinion on the question must be held to include the testimony in point of fact, and the judgment in point of opinion, of all those whom he had easy opportunities and strong inducements to consult. It may be added, that, however Henry Earl of Clarendon chose to express himself, (his language is not free from an air of mental reservation), neither he nor his brother Lord Rochester, when they published their father's history in 1702, thought fit, in their preface, to attempt any explanation of his silence respecting the Icon, though their attention must have been called to that subject by the controversy respecting it which had been carried on a few years before with great zeal and activity. Their silence becomes the more remarkable, from the strong interest taken by Lord Clarendon in the controversy. He wrote two letters on it to Wagstaffe, in 1694 and 1699. He was one of the few persons present at the select consecration of Wagstaffe as a non-juring bishop, in 1693. Yet there is no allusion to the Icon in the preface to his father's history, published in 1702.

It cannot be pretended that the final silence of Clarendon is agreeable to the rigorous rules of historical morality. It is no doubt an infirmity which impairs his credit as an historian. But it is a light and venial fault compared with that which must be laid to his charge, if we suppose, that, with a conviction of the genuineness of the Icon, and with such testimony in support of it as the evidence of Somerset and Morley,\* (to say nothing of others), he should not have made a single effort, in a work destined for posterity, to guard from the hands of the impostor the most sacred property of his unfortunate master. The partiality of Clarendon to Charles I. has never been severely blamed; his silence in his history, if he believed Gauden, would only be a new instance of that partiality; but the same silence, if he believed the King to be the author, would be fatal to his character as an historian and a man.

The knowledge of Gauden's secret was obtained by Clarendon as a minister; and he might deem his duty with respect to se-

---

\* Which Dr W.'s construction of his words to his son necessarily implies that he possessed before his death.

crets of state still to be so far in force, as at least to excuse him for not disturbing one of the favourite opinions of his party, and for not disclosing what he thought could gratify none but regicides and agitators. Even this excuse, on the opposite supposition, he wanted. That Charles was the author of the *Icon* (if true) was no state secret, but the prevalent and public opinion. He might have collected full proofs of its truth, in private conversation with his friends. He had only to state such proof, and to lament the necessity which made him once act as if the truth were otherwise, rather than excite a controversy with an unprincipled enemy, dangerous to a new government, and injurious to the interests of monarchy. His mere testimony would have done infinitely more for the King's authorship, than all the volumes which have been written to maintain it. EVEN THAT TESTIMONY IS WITHHELD.

It is generally believed, that since the appearance of Dr Wordsworth's *Documentary Supplement*, some of those eminent persons of this age who are most favourably disposed to Charles I., have declared, that the tacit acknowledgment of Clarendon is decisive of the whole question. It must always be remembered, that it is impossible, on any supposition, absolutely to *justify* the historian's silence. But it is at least intelligible on one supposition, while it is utterly unaccountable on the other. If the *Icon* be Gauden's, the silence of Clarendon is a vice to which he had strong temptations. If it be the King's, it is a crime without a motive. Those who are willing to ascribe the lesser fault to the historian, must determine against the authenticity of the *Icon*.

That good men, of whom Lord Clarendon was one, were, at the period of the Restoration, ready to use expedients of very dubious morality to conceal secrets dangerous to the Royal cause, will appear from a fact, which seems to have escaped the notice of the general historians of England. It is uncertain, and not worth inquiring, when Charles II. threw over his doubts and vices that slight and thin vesture of Catholicism, which he drew a little closer round him at the sight of death: \* But we know with certainty, that, in the beginning of the year 1659, the Duke of Ormond accidentally discovered the conversion, by finding him on his knees at mass in a church at Brussels. It was soon more satisfactorily proved to him,

---

\* His formal reconciliation probably took place at Cologne in 1658, under the direction of Dr Peter Talbot, Catholic archbishop of Armagh.

by communication with Henry Bennett and Lord Bristol.\* He first imparted the secret in England to Clarendon and Southampton, who agreed with him in the necessity of preventing the enemies of monarchy, or the friends of Popery, from promulgating this fatal secret. Accordingly, the '*Act for the better security of his Majesty's person and government*'† provided, that to affirm the King to be a Papist, should be punishable by 'disability to hold any office or promotion, civil, military, or ecclesiastical, besides being liable to such other punishments as by common or statute law might be inflicted.'‡ No sooner was the truth ascertained, than the utterance of it was subjected to severe penalties. The virtuous men (for such they were) who passed this Act, were, it must be owned, on this occasion, guilty of the most solemn and deliberate falsehood. They declared, by their actions, that to be a malicious calumny which they knew to be true. Nay, more, they forbade it as a calumny, solely *because* they knew it to be the truth. If any opposition had been made to it, they must have supported it by false asseverations, which could not, however, be a deeper offence against morality than the falsehood implied in their acts. Such is the unhappy condition of statesmen, that they may think themselves obliged to assert the falsehood of a statement most strongly, when they are most firmly convinced of its truth.

As soon as we take our stand on the ground, that the acquiescence of all the Royalists in the council and court of Charles II., and the final silence of Clarendon in his history on a matter so much within his province, and so interesting to his feelings, are irreconcilable with the supposition, that they believed the Icon to be the work of the King, all the other circumstances on both sides not only dwindle into insignificance, but assume a different colour. Thus, the general credit of the book among Royalists before the Restoration serves to show, that the evidence which changed the opinion of Clarendon and his friends must have been very strong—probably far stronger than what we now possess;—and the firmer we suppose the previous conviction to have been, the more probable it becomes, that the proofs then discovered were of a more direct nature than those which remain. Let it be very especially observed, that those who decided the question practically in 1660, were within twelve years of the fact; while fifty years had passed before the greater part of the traditional and hearsay stories, ranged on the opposite side, were brought together by Wagstaffe.

---

\* 2 Carte's Ormond, 254–256. † 13 C. 2. st. 1. 1661.

‡ A legislative declaration that such *disabilities* are *punishments*.



Let us consider, for example, the effect of the proceedings of 1660, upon the evidence of the witnesses who speak of the Icon as having been actually taken from the King at Naseby, and afterwards restored to him by the conquerors. Two of the best known, are the Earl of Manchester and Mr Prynne. Eales, a physician in Hertfordshire, certifies, in 1699, that some years before the Restoration, (*i. e.* about 1656), he heard Lord Manchester declare, that the MS. of the Icon was taken at Naseby, and that he had seen it in the King's own hand.\* Jones, at the distance of fifty years, says that he *had heard from* Colonel Stroud that Stroud *had heard from Prynne* in 1649, that he, *by order of Parliament*, had read the MS. of the Icon taken at Naseby.† Now it is certain that Manchester was taken into favour, and Prynne was patronized at the Restoration. If this were so, how came matters, of which they spoke so publicly, to remain unknown to Clarendon and Southampton? Had the MS. Icon been intrusted to Prynne by Parliament, or even by a Committee, its existence must have been known to so large a body, too large to allow the supposition of secrecy. The application of the same remark disposes of the mob of second-hand witnesses. The very number of the witnesses increases the incredibility that their testimony could have escaped notice in 1660. Huntingdon, a Major in Cromwell's regiment, who abandoned the Parliamentary cause, is a more direct witness. In the year 1679, he informed Dugdale that he had procured the MS. Icon taken at Naseby to be restored to the King at Hampton; that it was written *by Sir E. Walker, but interlined by the King*, who wrote all the Devotions. In 1681, Dugdale published 'The Short View,' &c., in which is the same story, with the variation, 'that it was written with the King's own hand'—a statement which, in the summary language of a general narrative, can hardly be said to vary materially from the former. Now, Major Huntingdon had particularly attracted the notice of Clarendon. He is mentioned in the History with commendation.‡ He tendered his services to the King before the Restoration;§ and, what is most important of all to our present purpose, his testimony regarding the conduct of Bukeley and Ashburnham, in the journey from Hampton Court, is expressly mentioned by the Noble historian as being, in 1660, thought worthy of being weighed even against that of Somerset and Southampton. || When we thus trace a di-

---

\* 'Who wrote,' &c. 93. Wagst. 79.

† Clar. V. 484, Oxf. Edit. 1826.

|| V. 495.

† Wagst. 80.

§ Id. VII. 432.

rect communication between him and the minister, and when we remember that it took place at the very time of the claim of Gauden, and that it related to events contemporary with the supposed recovery of the Icon, it is scarcely necessary to ask, whether Clarendon would not have sounded him on that subject, and whether Huntingdon would not then have boasted of such a personal service to the late King. It would be contrary to common sense not to presume that something then passed on that subject, and that, if Huntingdon's account at that time coincided with his subsequent story, it could not have been rejected, unless it was outweighed by contrary evidence. \* He must have been thought either a deceiver or deceived. For the more candid of these suppositions there was abundant scope. It is certain that one MS. (*not the Icon*) was taken with the King's correspondence at Naseby; *that it was written by Sir Edward Walker*; that it was corrected by the King, and restored to him by Fairfax, through an officer at Hampton Court. † This was an account of the military transactions in the Civil war, written by Walker, and published in his *Historical Discourses* long after. It was natural that the King should be pleased at the recovery of this manuscript, which he soon after sent from Hampton Court to Lord Clarendon in Jersey, as a 'Contribution' towards his History, 'his own Memorials, or those which, by his command, had been kept, and were perused and corrected by himself—out of which passages, the most important passages of 1644 and 1645, are faithfully collected.' ‡ How easily Huntingdon, an old soldier little versed in manuscripts, might, thirty years afterwards, have confounded these memorials with the Icon! A few prayers in the King's handwriting might have formed a part of the papers restored. So slight and probable are the only suppositions necessary to save the veracity of Huntingdon, and to destroy the value of his evidence.

Sir Thomas Herbert, who wrote his *Memoirs* § thirty years after the event, in the seventy-third year of his age, when, as he

---

\* Dr W. admits, that if Clarendon had consulted Duppa, Juxon, Sheldon, Morley, Kendal, Barwick, Legge, Herbert, &c. &c.; nay, if he had consulted only Morley alone, he must have been *satisfied*. (Dr W., of course, says for the King). Now, it is certain, from the message of Morley to Clarendon in 1674, that previous discussion had taken place between them. Does not this single fact decide the question on Dr W.'s own admission?

† Clar. V. 476, and Warburton's Note.

‡ London, 1813, p. 62, 63.

§ Wood, *Athenæ*.

told Antony Wood, 'he was grown old, and not in such a capacity as he could wish to publish it,' found a copy of the Icon among the books which Charles I. left to him, of which some are to be given to the King's children, he thought 'the handwriting so like, as to induce his belief that it was the King's; or, as Sir Philip Warwick states Herbert's testimony, (probably from a conversation more full than the Memoirs), \* 'he saw the MS. in the King's hand, as he believes, but it was *'in a running character, and not in that which the King usually wrote.'*† Now, more than one copy of the Icon might have been sent to Charles; they might have been written with some resemblances to his handwriting; but assuredly the original MS. would not have been loosely left to Herbert, with works on general subjects bequeathed to the King's children. It is equally certain that this was not the MS. from which the Icon was published a few days afterwards; and, above all, it is clear that information from Herbert ‡ would naturally be sought, and would have been easily procured, in 1660. The ministers of that time perhaps examined the MS.; or if it could not be produced, they might have asked why it was not preserved; a question to which, on the supposition of its being written by the King, it seems now impossible to imagine a satisfactory answer. The same observations are applicable to the story of Levett, a page, who said that he had seen the King writing the Icon, and had read several chapters of it, but more forcibly, from his being less likely to be intrusted, and more liable to confusion and misrecollection—to say nothing of our ignorance of his character for veracity, and of the interval of forty-two years which had passed before the date of his attestation on this subject.

The Naseby copy being the only fragment of positive evidence in support of the King's authorship, one more observation on it may be excused. If the Parliamentary leaders thought the Icon so dangerous to their cause, and so likely to make an impression favourable to the King, how came they to restore it so easily to its author, whom they had deeply injured by the publication of his private letters? The advocates of the King charge this publication on them, as an act of gross indelicacy, and at

---

\* Warwick died in 1683. Herbert's Memoirs were first published in 1702.

† Warwick Memoirs, 69, London, 1701. How much this coincides with Gauden's account, that his wife had disguised the writing of the copy sent to the Isle of Wight!

‡ Made a Baronet at the Restoration, for his personal services to Charles I.

the same time ascribe to them, in the restoration of the Icon, a singular instance of somewhat wanton generosity.

It is obviously unreasonable to waste minute criticism upon every rumour of a conversation, between 1648 and 1700, which Wagstaffe has heaped together on this subject. No book could ever be condemned as spurious, if such proofs of its authenticity were of any value. It may be a question whether lawyers are justified in altogether rejecting hearsay evidence; but it never can be supposed, in its best state, to be other than secondary. When it passes through many hands—when it is given after a long time—when it is to be found almost solely in one party—when it relates to a subject which deeply interests their feelings,—we may confidently place it at the very bottom of the scale; and without being able either to disprove many particular stories, or to ascertain the proportion in which each of them is influenced by unconscious exaggeration, inflamed zeal, intentional falsehood, inaccurate observation, confused recollection, or eager credulity, we may safely treat the far greater part as the natural produce of these grand causes of human delusion. A very few specimens of these stories may however be here very shortly stated; not that they deserve the trouble of confutation, but that they show the straits to which the Iconolatrists are driven. Bishop Bull had heard, in a conversation *forty-five years* before, from Dr Gough, that the latter was employed in recovering several papers of the King, taken at Naseby, containing his private thoughts and meditations, and that he found they were the same with part of the Icon. (Words. 34.)

One gentleman (name, time, and place unknown!) declared, that he had seen the King write what he afterwards found to be part of it! (Id. 115.) One Dilling having, *forty years* after, said that *he had been told* by his father that he had seen, in the hands of Lord Montague, a MS. which he *judged* to be in the King's hand, and which, as well as he could remember, was the same as some of the printed chapters of the Icon. (Words. 117.)

Wagstaffe, in 1699, told the public that he had *heard* from Captain Philips that his father-in-law, Captain Molineux, *said* that, in his presence, at a dinner with Ireton and Ludlow at Cashel, *forty-nine years* before, Colonel Hammond declared the Icon to have been written by the King at Carisbrook. (Words. 129, and Wagst. 99.) Forty or fifty years after this event, Hearne, a servant of Sir Philip Warwick, declares that he had heard his master and one Oudart often say that they had transcribed the Icon from a copy in Charles's handwriting. (Words. 138.) It is evident that such rumours by an unknown man of what he had heard long before from another equally unknown, prove no-

thing but the desperate state to which the Iconists are reduced. The last story, however, very fortunately refers to authorities still in our possession, and affords a sample of what would befall the rest, if we had the same means of detection. Sir Philip Warwick (who is thus said to have copied the Icon from the King's MS.) has himself positively told us, '*I cannot say I know that he wrote the Icon which goes under his name;*'\* and Oudart was secretary to Sir Edward Nicholas, whose letter to Gauden, virtually acknowledging his claim, has been already quoted!

The first collector of the major part of these tales was Wagstaffe; and on the opinion entertained of his judgment and veracity, the best portion of their feeble evidence, that which consists in the occasional specification of names, times and places, must chiefly depend. It is fit then to let the reader see a specimen of his modesty and justice. 'Milton,' says he, 'a man of that complexion that would have ventured as far to BROACH a LIE as any of his followers.' (*Wagst. Pref. ix.*) The same Wagstaffe employs many pages in an attempt to prove that Milton tempted a printer, by the offer of liberty, to insert a prayer from Sir P. Sidney's *Arcadia* in the Icon, to afford himself the opportunity of aspersing the King's piety, and that he finally succeeded in this infamous falsification. These passages are not quoted, either because any one could now stoop to refute them, (they are refuted by the name of Milton), or because it is worth while to feel indignation at the audacity of a forgotten scribbler, but merely to show by how much prejudice, or by how little restraint, the mind of Mr Wagstaffe was influenced at the time when he collected the rumours and surmises which are now once more produced, as proofs that Charles I. was the author of *Icon Basilike*.

Very little more need be said on this subject. Two persons appear to have been privy to the composition of the Icon by Gauden,—his wife, and Walker his curate. Mrs Gauden, immediately after her husband's death, applied to Lord Bristol for favour, on the ground of her knowledge of the secret, adding, that the Bishop was prevented only by death from writing to him (surely to the same effect). Nine years afterwards she sent to one of her sons the papers on this subject, to be used ('if there be a good occasion to make it manifest'); among which was an epitome ('epittimey') 'drawn out by the hand of him that did hope to have made a fortune by it.'† This is followed by her narrative of the whole transactions, on which

---

\* Warw. 68.

† Docum. Supplem. 42. 48.

two short remarks will suffice. It coincides with Gauden's Letters in the most material particulars, in appeals to the same eminent persons said to be privy to the secret, who might and must have been consulted after such appeal: it proves also her firm persuasion that her husband had been ungratefully requited, and that her family had still pretensions founded on his services, which these papers might one day enable them to assert with more effect.

It would needlessly prolong this article to point out the many circumstances which show that Mrs Gauden must have certainly known whether the book was composed by her husband, who indeed said that the characters had been disguised by her; a fact which receives so unexpected a corroboration from the account given by Sir J. Herbert to Sir Philip Warwick, that 'though Herbert believed the MS. to be the King's hand, it 'was not that in which the King usually wrote.'\*

Walker the curate tells us that he had a hand in the business all along. He wrote this book, it is true, forty-five years after the events. But this circumstance, which so deeply affects the testimony of men who speak of words spoken in conversation, and reaching them through three or four hands, rather explains the inaccuracies, than lessens the substantial weight, of one who speaks of his own acts, on the most, and perhaps only, remarkable occasion of his life. There are two facts in Walker's account which seem to be decisive;—namely, that Gauden told him, about the time of the fabrication, that the MS. was sent by the Duke of Somerset to the King, and that two chapters of it were added by Bishop Duppá. To both these witnesses Gauden appealed at the Restoration, and Mrs G. after his death. Even these communications were somewhat indiscreet; but, if false, what temptation had Gauden at that time to invent them, and to communicate them to his curate? They were new means of detecting his imposture. But the declaration of Gauden, that the book and figure was wholly and solely my 'invention, making and design,' is quoted with premature triumph, as if it were repugnant to the composition of two chapters by Duppá; †—as if the contribution of a few pages to a volume could affect the authorship of the man who had planned the whole, and executed all the rest. That he mentioned the particular contribution of Duppá at the time to Walker, and only appealed in general to the same prelate in his applications to Clarendon and the King, is a variation, but

---

\* War. 69.

† Wordsworth, p. 156.

no inconsistency. The same general agreement pervades the accounts of the three persons who describe themselves as privy to the fabrication. Gauden in 1660, Mrs G. in 1671, and Walker in 1694, agree in substance; and Walker, the last of them, testifies, that Gauden had, in 1648, mentioned his intercourse with Somerset and Duppa, whom, in 1660, he immediately cited as his principal witnesses. Trimnell, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, was converted to belief in Gauden by the correspondence now published. The learned Bishop Patrick, as we are told by Whiston, was convinced of the spuriousness of the *Icon*. Kennett, a laborious man well informed in the history of those times, is in effect a valuable witness on the same side. For though he thought it probable that Gauden only made additions to the King's MS., and procured Bishop Duppa to add a chapter to it, yet the effect of his admission extends much farther.\* For the discovery of unavowed insertions by an editor spreads a taint of fraud over his whole publication, and no part of it can be reasonably trusted, at least until it be determined by positive evidence, where truth ends and forgery begins. Kennett seems to have thought the frequent play on the word 'Gaudy,' in a pamphlet against the *Icon* in 1649, a proof that Gauden was then suspected to be the writer. That his name was written 'Gaudy' in the Journals of the House of Commons, is a slight circumstance mentioned above, which was unknown to Kennett, and which tallies with his inference.

Walker early represented the coincidence of some peculiar phrases in the devotions of the *Icon*, with Gauden's phraseology, as an important fact in the case. That argument has recently been presented with much more force by Mr Todd, whose catalogue of coincidences between the *Icon* and the avowed writings of Gauden is certainly entitled to serious consideration.† They are not all of equal importance, but some of the phrases are certainly very peculiar. It seems very unlikely that Charles should have copied peculiar phrases from the not very conspicuous writings of Gauden's early life; and it is almost equally improbable that Gauden, in his later writings, when he is said to be eager to reap the fruits of his imposture, should not have carefully shunned those modes of expression which were peculiar to the *Icon*. To the list of Mr Todd, a very curious addition has been made by Mr Benjamin Bright, a discerning and liberal collector, from a manuscript volume of prayers by Gauden,‡ which is of more value than the other

---

\* Kennett's *Historical Register*, 774.

† Todd's *Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury*, 51-76.

‡ Todd, *App. No. I.*

coincidences, inasmuch as it corroborates the testimony of Walker, who said that he '*met with expressions in the devotional parts of the Icon very frequently used by Dr Gauden in his prayers!*'

Without laying the greatest stress on these resemblances, they are certainly of more weight than the general arguments founded either on the inferiority of Gauden's talents, (which Dr Wordsworth candidly abandons), or on the impure and ostentatious character of his style, which have little weight unless we suppose him to have had no power of varying his manner when he speaks in the person of another man.

Conclusions from internal evidence have so often been contradicted by experience, that prudent inquirers seldom rely on them when there are any other means of forming a judgment. But in such cases as the present, internal evidence does not so much depend on the discussion of words or the dissection of sentences, as on the impression made by the whole composition, on minds long accustomed to estimate and compare the writings of different men in various circumstances. A single individual can do little more than describe that impression; and he must leave it to be determined by experience, how far it agrees with the impressions made on the minds of the majority of other men of similar qualifications. To us it seems, as it did to Archbishop Herring, that the Icon is greatly more like the work of a Priest than a King. It has more of dissertation than effusion. It has more regular division and systematic order than agree with the habits of the King. The choice and arrangement of words show a degree of care and neatness which are seldom attained but by a practised writer. The views of men and affairs too, are rather those of a bystander than an actor. They are chiefly reflections, sometimes in themselves obvious, but often ingeniously turned, such as the surface of events would suggest to a spectator not too deeply interested. It betrays none of those strong feelings which the most vigilant regard to gravity and dignity could not have uniformly banished from the composition of an actor and a sufferer. It has no allusion to facts not accessible to any moderately informed man; though the King must have (sometimes rightly) thought that his superior knowledge of affairs would enable him to correct vulgar mistakes. If it be really the private effusion of a man's thoughts on himself and his own affairs, it would be the only writing of that sort in the world in which it is impossible to select a trace of peculiarities and weaknesses, partialities and dislikes, of secret opinions, of favourite idioms, and habitual familiarities of expression. Every thing is *impersonal*. It consists entirely of generalities; while real writings



of this sort never fail to be characterized by those minute and circumstantial touches, which parties deeply interested cannot, if they would, avoid. It is also very observable, that the Icon dwells little on facts, where mistake might so easily betray it not to be the King's, and expatiates in reasoning and reflection, of which it is impossible to try the genuineness by any palpable test. The absence of every allusion to those secrets of which it would be very hard for the King himself wholly to conceal his knowledge, seems indeed to indicate the hand of a writer who was afraid of venturing on ground where his ignorance might expose him to irretrievable blunders. Perhaps also the want of all the smaller strokes of character betrays a timid and faltering forger, who, though he ventured to commit a pious fraud, shrunk from an irreverent imitation of the Royal feelings, and was willing, after the great purpose was served, so to soften the imposture, as to leave his retreat open, and to retain the means, in case of positive detection, of representing the book to have been published as what might be put into the King's mouth, rather than as what was actually spoken by him.

The section which relates to the Civil Wars in Ireland, not only exemplifies the above remarks, but deeply connects the question respecting the Icon with the character of Charles for sincerity. It certainly was not more unlawful for him to seek the aid of the Irish Catholics, than it was for his opponents to call in the succour of the Scotch Presbyterians. Both parties to a war are equally entitled to strengthen themselves by alliances; and to obtain allies by all legitimate concessions. The Parliament procured the assistance of the Scotch army, by the imposition of the Covenant in England; and the King might, on the like principle, purchase the help of the Irish, by promising to tolerate, and even establish, the Catholic religion in Ireland. Warburton justly observes, that the King was free from blame in his negotiations with the Irish, 'as a politician, and King, and governor of his people. But the necessity of his affairs obliging him at the same time to play the PROTESTANT SAINT AND CONFESSOR, there was found much disagreement between his professions, and declarations, and actions in this matter.'\* As long as the disagreement was confined to official declarations and to acts of state, it must be owned that it is extenuated by the practice of politicians, and by the consideration, that the concealment of negotiations, which is a lawful end, can very often be obtained by no other means than a disavowal of them. The rigid moralist may regret this excuse, though it be founded on that high public convenience to which Warburton gives the

---

\* Clarendon, vii. 591. Ed. 1826.

name of necessity. But all mankind will allow, that the express or implied denial of real negociations in a private work, a picture of the writer's mind, professing to come from the man and not from the King, mixed with solemn appeals and fervid prayers to the Deity, is a far blacker and more aggravated instance of insincerity. It is not, therefore, an act of judicious regard to the memory of Charles to ascribe to him the composition of the twelfth section of the Icon. The impression manifestly aimed at in that section is, that the imputation of a private connexion with the Irish revolvers was a mere calumny; and in the only paragraph which approaches to particulars, it expressly confines his intercourse with them to the negociation for a time through Ormond, and declares that his only object was to save 'the poor Protestants of Ireland from their desperate enemies.' In the section which relates to the publication of his letters, when the Parliament had explicitly charged him with clandestine negociations, nothing is added on the subject. The general protestations of innocence, not very specifically applied even to the first instigation of the revolt, are left in that indefinite state in which the careless reader may be led to apply them to all subsequent transactions, which are skillfully, not to say artfully, passed over in silence. It is however certain, that the Earl of Glamorgan, a Catholic nobleman, was authorized by Charles to negotiate with the Catholics in 1645, independently of Ormond, and with powers, into the nature of which the Lord Lieutenant thought himself bound not curiously to pry. It is certain that, in the spring of that year, he concluded a secret treaty with the Catholic Assembly at Kilkenny, by which (besides the repeal of penalties or disabilities) all the churches and church property in Ireland occupied by the Catholics since the revolt, were continued and secured to them;\* and they, on their parts, engaged to send ten thousand troops to the King's assistance in England. Some correspondence on this subject was captured at sea, and some was seized in Ireland; and both were immediately published by the Parliament, which compelled the King to imprison and disavow Glamorgan.† It is clear that these were measures of policy, merely intended to conceal the truth.‡ It is unnecessary here to relate any part

---

\* Birch's Inquiry, 68, and Dr Lingard, vi. 656. The King's warrant, on 12th March 1645, gives Glamorgan power 'to treat with the Roman Catholics upon necessity, wherein our Lieutenant cannot so well be seen.' Birch, 20.

† Harleian Miscell. V.

‡ See a curious Letter published by Leland, History of Ireland,

of the sequel. Sufficient has been stated to show, that the King, if he was the writer of the Icon, must have deliberately left on the minds of the readers of that book an opinion, of his connexion with the Irish Catholics, which he knew to be false. On the other hand it is to be observed, that Gauden could not have known the secret of the Irish negotiations; that he would naturally avoid a subject of which he was ignorant, and confine himself to a general disavowal of the instigation of the revolt. The silence of the Icon on this subject, if written by Gauden, would be neither more wonderful nor more blameable than that of Clarendon, who, though he was of necessity acquainted with the negotiations of Glamorgan, does not suffer an allusion to the true state of them to escape him, either in the History, or in that apology for Ormond's administration, which he calls 'A short View of the State of Ireland.' Let it not be said, either by Charles's mistaken friends, or by his undistinguishing enemies, that he incurs the same blame for suffering *an omission calculated to deceive* to remain in the Icon of Gauden, as if he had himself written the book. If the manuscript was sent to him by Gauden in September 1648, he may have intended to direct an explanation of the Irish negotiations to be inserted in it. He may not have finally determined on the immediate publication. At all events, it would be cruel to require that he should have critically examined, and deliberately weighed, every part of a manuscript, which he could only occasionally snatch a moment to read in secret during the last four months of his life. In this troubled and dark period, divided between great negotiations, violent removals, and preparations for asserting his dignity, if he could not preserve his life, justice, as much as generosity, requires that we should not hold him responsible for a negative offence, however important, in a manuscript which he had then only read. But if he was the author, none of these extenuations have any place. He must then have composed the work several years before his death. He was likely to have frequently examined it. He doubtless read it with fresh attention, after it was restored to him at Hampton Court; and he afterwards added several chapters to it. On

---

Book v. c. 7. which clearly proves that the blindness of Ormond was voluntary, and that he was either trusted with the secret, or discovered it; and that the imprisonment of Glamorgan was, what the Parliament called it, '*A colourable commitment.*' Leland is one of those writers who deserve more reputation than they enjoy. He is not only an elegant writer; but, considering his time and country, singularly candid, unprejudiced, and independent.

that supposition, the fraudulent omission must have been a contrivance 'aforethought,' carried on for years, persisted in at the approach of death, and left, as the dying declaration of a pious monarch, in a state calculated to impose a falsehood upon posterity.

After sketching the above, we have been convinced, by a re-perusal of the note of Mr Laing \* on this subject, that if he had employed his great abilities as much in unfolding facts as in ascertaining them, nothing could have been written for the *Icon*, or ought to have been written against it, since that decisive note. His merit, as a critical inquirer into history, an enlightened collector of materials, and a sagacious judge of evidence, has never been surpassed. If any man believes the innocence of Queen Mary, after an impartial and dispassionate perusal of Mr Laing's examination of her case, the state of such a man's mind would be a subject worthy of much consideration by a philosophical observer of human nature. In spite of his ardent love of liberty, no man has yet presumed to charge him with the slightest sacrifice of historical integrity to his zeal. That he never perfectly attained the art of full, clear, and easy narrative, was owing to the peculiar style of those writers who were popular in his youth, and may be mentioned as a remarkable instance of the disproportion of particular talents to general vigour of mind.

---

Having frequently mentioned the edition of Clarendon which has just been published at Oxford, we may take this opportunity of saying a few words on it. Nothing, however, need be added on the merit of the history itself, which has long undergone the irrevocable judgment of time, and which most men now agree in considering as one of the noblest historical works of the English nation.

The University of Oxford has a claim to public gratitude for the recent editions of Burnett and Clarendon. That they published both, and that Burnett should be the first, are indications of a liberal spirit. That the work of the Whig Bishop should, a century after his death, issue from the Clarendon press, under the superintendence of one of the most accomplished and venerable persons of the University, is a consolatory proof of the final triumph of justice over the most deep-rooted prejudice. The present edition of Clarendon is the first correct and com-

---

\* Hist. of Scot.

plete publication of his history. The passages omitted, and the words altered, in the original and all succeeding editions, are now for the first time laid before the public. It does not indeed appear why the learned editor has retained the defective and erroneous text of former editions, and placed the genuine language of Lord Clarendon in the margin. The reverse order would have been perhaps more convenient. The suppressions and alterations are neither few nor inconsiderable. Many of them no doubt are trivial. Some of them, such as the very severe description of Lord Arundel, were omitted as needlessly offensive, though it affords one of the best samples of the historian's power and will to be sarcastic. Even in these cases the liberty taken by the original editors \* would have been better justified if it had been frankly avowed. It is not easy to reconcile even such variations with the language of Lord Rochester in the Preface to the first edition. 'They who put forth this history DARE not take upon them to make any alterations in a work of this kind, solemnly left with them to be published !' But many of these variations have evidently a political purpose. The frequent substitution, for example, in the printed edition, of the hostile term 'Papist,' for the respectful appellation of 'Catholic' used in Clarendon's MS., cannot have been accidental. Some of the suppressions arising from civility are not justifiable; such, for instance, as the insinuation of corruption against Lord Conway in the Scotch war,† which would have afforded a means of trying the historian's general justice; and the passage where Lord Clarendon said in his MS. of the Scotch, that 'their whole religion consisted in a detestation of Popery,' which the editors changed into 'a great part of their religion,' ‡ thereby depriving the reader of that antidote against the writer's censure in other instances, which so egregious an exaggeration would have afforded.

But instead of minutely pursuing these variations, we shall content ourselves with two conspicuous instances of the liberty with which Lord Rochester treated his father's work, and of the manifest bias under which he and his colleagues acted. Both are exemplified, by a comparison of the character of General Monk, as it stood in the MS. of Clarendon, and as it was shown to the world in the printed text of his History.

---

\* Lord Rochester, Bishop Sprat, and Dean Aldrich.

† Clar. I. 256.

‡ Clar. I. 187.

## Character of Monk.

### CLARENDON'S MANUSCRIPT.

And his answer to the Lord of Ormond was so rough and doubtfull, *having had no other education but Dutch and Devonshire, that he thought not fit to trust him.*

Cromwell prevailed with Monk, for his liberty and money, which he loved heartily, to engage himself again in the war of Ireland.

He himself had no fumes of religion to turn his head, nor any credit with, or dependance upon, any who were swayed by those trances, *only he was cursed, after a long familiarity, to marry a woman of the lowest extraction, the least wit, and less beauty; who, taking no care for any other part of herself, had deposited her soul with some Presbyterian ministers, who disposed her to that interest.* She was a woman 'nihil muliebri præter corpus gerens;' so utterly unacquainted with all persons of quality of either sex, that there was no possible approach to him by her.

Whereupon his brother began his journey to Edinburgh, where the General received him well. But after he had staid some time there, and found an opportunity to tell him on what errand he came, he found him to be so far from the temper of a brother, that after infinite reproaches for his daring to endeavour to corrupt him, he required him to leave that kingdom, using many oaths to him, that if he ever ventured to return with the same proposition, *he would cause him to be hanged; with which the poor man was so terrified, that he was glad when he was gone, and never had the courage after to undertake the like employment.*

And at that time *there is no question the General had not the least thought or purpose to contribute to the King's restoration, the hope whereof he believed to be desperate; and the disposition that did grow in him afterwards, did arise from those accidents which fell out, and even obliged him to undertake that which proved so much to his profit and glory.* And yet from this very time, his brother being known, and his

### PRINTED TEXT.

And his answer to the Lord of Ormond was so rough and doubtful that he thought not fit to trust him.

Cromwell prevailed with Monk, for his liberty and preferment, to engage himself again, &c.

He himself had no fumes of fanaticism to turn his head, nor any credit with, or dependance upon, any who were swayed by those trances.

errand he came, he soon dismissed him, without discovering to him any inclination to the business he came about, advising him to return no more to him with such propositions.

In truth, at that time the General had not given the least public proof that he had any thought or purpose of contributing to the King's restoration, which he might possibly think to be desperate. Some rather believed, that the disposition which afterwards grew in him, towards it, did arise from divers accidents, which fell out in the course of affairs, and seemed even to oblige him to undertake that which, in the end,

## CLARENDON'S MANUSCRIPT.

journey taken notice of, it was generally believed in Scotland that he had a purpose to serve the King, which his Majesty took no pains to disclaim, either there or in England.

And for the second presumption upon *his understanding and ratiocination, alas ! it was not equal to the enterprise.* HE could not bear so many and so different contrivances in his head together, as were necessary to that work, and it was the King's great happiness that he never had it in his purpose to serve him till it fell to be in his power, and indeed till he had NOTHING ELSE to do. If he had resolved it sooner, he had been destroyed himself, &c.

## PRINTED TEXT.

conducted so much to his greatness and glory: Yet from that very time, his brother's inclinations to the King being known, and his journey taken notice of, it was generally believed in Scotland that he had a purpose to serve the King, which his Majesty took no pains to disclaim, either there or in England.

And it was the King's great happiness that the General never owned his purpose to serve his Majesty, till it fell to be in his power, and indeed was the best thing in his power to do. If he had declared his resolution sooner, he had destroyed himself.

Now, it cannot be denied that these are important suppressions; and that the intention of every one of them is to conceal whatever can lower Monk. So great is the solicitude for this end, that even a sneer at his 'Dutch and Devonshire education' is carefully excluded. Instead of love of money, which Lord Clarendon attributes to Monk, the courteous editors call his object by the more decent name of 'preferment.' The vulgar vices of his wife, painted with complacency and warmth by Clarendon, are not allowed by the editors to stain the hero whom they delight to honour. His coarse and brutal reception of his brother, who was sent to him in Scotland by the Royalists of Cornwall, is converted by them into just caution and politic reserve. Clarendon's certain knowledge that Monk had no original purpose to contribute to the Restoration, and that his disposition to do so grew from events which afterwards made it conducive to his own profit and glory, has been for a hundred and twenty years concealed from the world, by the unwarrantable suppressions of the editors, in contradiction to their own solemn asseverations. And, lastly, the mean opinion entertained by Clarendon of his talents has been kept back, and instead of the historian's declaration that HE, Monk, had not the wisdom, or courage, or understanding to execute the great work, the editors tell us in *their* text that '*no man living*' could have done so! The result of the whole is, that the impression left on the mind about Monk by the spurious text, is quite different from that intended in the genuine. The character of the chief actor in a great revolution is always an

historical fact of no small moment. Even the judgment formed of him by a near and sagacious observer, is itself also a fact which in this case illustrates the event, as well as the character both of the hero and the historian. It will also be observed, that the last passage affords far less proof of the historian's sagacity than his own original text.

But, lest it should be said that these omissions are excused by a faulty, perhaps, but pardonable tenderness for the character of the restorer of monarchy, it is necessary to advert to another alteration of a much more serious sort, which assuredly did not originate in a disposition to spare the memory of the eminent person to whom it relates. Mr Pym, during his life, earned the enmity of the court, and the malice of the royalist writers attributed his death to a fabulous disease, of which they represented the loathsome symptoms as a judgment from heaven. The editors of Clarendon have made him continue the persecution of Pym beyond the grave, and extend it even to his pecuniary integrity. In speaking of the opposition of the House of Commons to the enlistment of eight thousand Irish Catholics for the service of Spain and France, our historian tells us, that this interference was ascribed by many to the instigation of the French ambassador; and he is made to go on as follows, in all the editions of his history which appeared before the present year.

'Some said boldly, and *ONE OR TWO* have *since affirmed as upon their own knowledge*, that Mr Pym received five thousand pounds from that French minister to hinder that supply to Spain.'

Now, the reader's attention is entreated to the genuine text, as it is restored from the Noble writer's own manuscript, in the Oxford edition of this year.

'Some said boldly, and *AN OBSCURE PERSON OR TWO* have since affirmed it *as upon their own knowledge*, that he received five thousand pounds to hinder that supply to Spain.' \*

If there be any truth in the declaration that the sons did not *dare* to alter their father's text, we should expect them to adhere to it most religiously in those parts of his work where he speaks as an historian of men who were his most distinguished opponents in civil war. But in this passage they have made him say the very reverse of what he really did say. By the words '*one or two obscure persons*,' he plainly meant to discredit the report which their false text has for a hundred and twenty years served to accredit. The text, as it has hitherto stood, is artfully contrived to give the full authority of the historian to the imputation, without absolutely ascribing it to him;

---

\* Clarendon, I. 493. Oxford, 1826.



for 'one or two' might naturally be understood as spoken of persons whom he knew and believed, while, on the other hand, a greater number than 'one or two' could hardly speak of, such bribes 'as from their own knowledge.' Lord Clarendon gave an undeserved permanence to a malignant rumour, but he at least circulated the antidote with the poison. By referring to the only witnesses as 'one or two obscure persons,' he reduced them to the lowest degree in the scale of credibility. To omit such a corrective, and by that omission to allow the unskilful, unwary, or prejudiced reader, to rate these witnesses as high as he pleases, is surely a fault which could not be adequately characterized without the use of very harsh language.

These suppressions and variations remind us of an incident once of considerable note in our literary history. About the year 1730, Oldmixon, an historical writer of moderate talent, whose works are not without useful information, charged Bishop Atterbury, Bishop Smallridge, and Dean Aldrich, whom he calls the Oxford editors, with altering and interpolating Clarendon's history. He supported this charge by the testimony of a Colonel Duckett, who was member of parliament for Calne, and a Commissioner of the Customs, and who affirmed that he had heard the fact in the year 1710, from Edmund Smith, the author of Phedra and Hippolitus, a person then celebrated at Oxford for his irregularities and talents. The altered passages, according to his account of Smith's statement, amounted to several hundreds; and among them he mentioned the famous passage in the character of Hampden, '*He had a head to contrive, a tongue to persuade, and a hand to execute any mischief.*' Atterbury, then in exile, immediately proved the material inaccuracies of Oldmixon's statement; neither he nor his friend Smallridge were at all concerned in the publication, nor had he ever seen the MS. Dr Burton, a man celebrated for the elegance of his Latin compositions, undertook a more full confutation of Oldmixon.\* The supposed interpolation about Hampden was shown to be in the original MS. Oldmixon accordingly withdrew that charge; and though he adhered to the accusation of general infidelity against the editors, the controversy seemed to be so triumphantly terminated, that, ever since, the accusation has seldom been more mildly mentioned than as a specimen of that eager and malicious credulity, which is nearly akin to intentional falsehood, and productive of all its mischievous effects.

The number of alterations, however, now seems much greater than that spoken of by Smith. In the first book, which, in the new edition, contains a hundred and eighty pages, there are

---

\* Genuineness of Lord Clarendon's History vindicated, 1744.

more than six hundred alterations, of which not a few are suspicious. In the second, in a hundred and thirteen pages, there are nearly three hundred. In the third, which extends to two hundred pages, are near seven hundred—among which is the memorable omission respecting Pym. That Smith was himself employed to make them, is a mistake into which Duckett, at the distance of twenty years, might have honestly fallen. Though the words respecting Hampden be certainly genuine, it is not wonderful that a general rumour of numerous alterations should, in its progress from hand to hand, be at last specifically applied to that passage, then so repugnant to the opinions encouraged by the government, and entertained by the whole nation, except the inferior gentry and clergy. That these mistatements were not intentional, is the more probable, because the mistake of the names of the editors was undoubtedly only a misrecollection. The number and tendency of the alterations actually made by them agree with the accounts which he received. Suppressions may be as faulty as interpolations; and it cannot be doubted, that the suppression of the passages relating to Monk is a greater injury to historical truth than it would have suffered from the interpolation of the sentence against Hampden. For though the memory of Monk was branded with indelible infamy by the demonstration in Mackenzie's *Memoirs*, that he had betrayed the confidential letters of Argyle, in order to destroy that nobleman; yet it was not until the present publication of the first genuine Clarendon, that we could know the contempt and disgust with which the most illustrious Royalists were compelled, by their own honest feelings, to regard the character of the chief instrument in the Restoration. The supposed addition in the case of Hampden, in truth, told us nothing new. Lord Clarendon is the important witness who bears testimony to the commanding genius, the skilful eloquence, the honourable life, and the unparalleled popularity of that great preserver of the liberties of his country. Lord Clarendon, as soon as he ceased to act with Mr Hampden, *must* have considered or represented his wisdom, eloquence, and valour, as exerted to produce 'mischief.' 'A head to contrive, a tongue to persuade, and a hand to execute,' are the highest qualities of human nature. That they were united by Hampden, we may firmly believe, on the evidence of a competent judge and a determined opponent: while the addition of 'any mischief,' serves scarcely any other purpose than that of placing in the strongest light that merit which could extort from an enemy, unable to repress his acrimony, such transcendent praise.

It is right to observe, that the University of Oxford had no share in the first publication of Clarendon, and were in no degree answerable for its faults. On the other hand, they have the unalloyed credit of restoring the true text of the noble historian; in this publication, and in that of Burnett, they deserve the gratitude of men of letters for putting into their hands, at a very moderate price, convenient and agreeable, as well as correct and complete, editions of two of the most important works of English history.

It is perhaps needless to add, that we cannot, without some limitations, assent to one remark made by the learned and meritorious editor of this edition. 'The present collation,' he says, 'satisfactorily proves, that the noble editors have in no 'one instance added, *suppressed*, or *altered* any historical fact.' (Advertisement, v.) It is only in the most narrow and literal sense of the words 'historical fact,' that it is possible to accede to the truth of this remark; and even in that most restricted acceptation, it may well be doubted whether the omission of Monk's treatment of his brother, and of his late concurrence in the Restoration, did not amount to the suppression of historical facts. The omission of the testimony, still extant in Lord Clarendon's handwriting, and evidently intended by him for publication as much as any other words in the history, that the charge of bribery against Pym rested on no better foundation than the assertion of 'one or two OBSCURE PERSONS,' is undoubtedly a suppression of evidence very blameable in itself, and by no means calculated to inspire confidence in the general good faith of the first editors.

The manuscript from which the first edition was printed, is now in the Bodleian Library; it is referred to by Dr Bandinell as MS. A, and was written in 1699 by Mr Wogan, then Captain of Westminster School; and Mr Low, Secretary to Sprat, who was at that time Bishop of Rochester. Two other MSS. are extant in the same Library, in the handwriting of Lord Clarendon; one of his Life, referred to as MS. B, and one of his History, referred to as MS. C. The copy made for the press by Wogan and Low, was not, however, taken from the original MSS. B and C, but from an intermediate MS, written (as it is said) under the superintendence of the noble historian by one Shaw, of whom nothing is known; when, or how, or where it was written, is also unknown to us. Its existence before 1686, when Henry Earl of Clarendon went to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant, is ascertained by a memorandum of Archbishop Sancroft, found in the Bodleian Library, describing it, and acknowledging the loan of it to him by

that nobleman before his departure. It is no longer to be found ; and its fate was unknown eighty years ago, when Dr Burton wrote his ‘ Genuineness of Clarendon’s History asserted.’ \* He indeed conjectures, that it might have been destroyed ‘ in the fire at the Earl of Rochester’s house at New Park, several years after the publication.’ But that house (at Petersham) was burnt on the 1st of October 1721, † ten years after the death of Lawrence, first Earl of Rochester of the family of Hyde, and nearly twenty years after the publication of the History. The MS. A, was seen by Wogan, the copyist, in 1731 and 1735 ; ‡ and, though of no authority, it was preserved, and is still extant in the Bodleian Library, while the transcript by Shaw, which, if really made under the inspection of the author, is of high importance, has altogether disappeared.

The best accounts, however, of the present state of the MS., seem to show that Shaw did no more than insert certain parts of the Life in the History at the places indicated by the author’s marks, and that his copy was in all other respects a verbal transcript of the original MS. This inference becomes almost certain, from the recent discovery at Oxford of six sheets, certainly of Shaw’s transcript, containing a narrative of Lord Clarendon’s reception at Madrid, and agreeing minutely with his original MS, in which the description of the bull-fights is marked to be left out, and a connecting word or two, rendered necessary by that omission, are interlined in the handwriting of Lawrence Earl of Rochester. The description is accordingly omitted in Wogan’s copy, and, by consequence, in the first edition. We must therefore presume that Shaw’s transcript agreed with the originals still extant, and that the variations in the printed history from them, were also variations from it. The interlineations by Lawrence Earl of Rochester, in a passage where we know an omission to have been made, leaves no ground for any other belief. Nor indeed could it be allowed (if it were otherwise) to supersede their authority, unless we knew something of the transcriber, and had some evidence that his variations (if any such should appear) were authorized by the historian himself. It would be altogether unreasonable to attempt to build any excuse for the sons of the historian, by wholly gratuitous suppositions about the contents of a MS., of which we owe the loss, on the most candid hypothesis, to their not very filial negligence. To us at least, the MSS. in Lord Clarendon’s handwriting are now alone of authority. Tried by that standard, the assailants of Oldmixon

seem to have been more successful in discovering inaccuracies in his accusation, than in exculpating the original editors of Clarendon. Flaws they did point out; but of any falsehood at once intentional and important, it rather appears that he ought to be acquitted. The general charge against the editors, of not having '*fairly*' printed the History, had indeed been publicly made in the House of Commons about the year 1725, before the publication of Oldmixon, by Sir Joseph Jekyll, a man of very grave authority,\* and who had the best means of accurate information.

It appears, from the Oxford edition of Burnett, that his sons also used an unwarrantable liberty in suppressing passages of their father's work. All such omissions are of evil example, and deserving severe reprehension. The editors of Burnett, however, appear to have left out only what they thought either discreditable to their father, or needlessly injurious to other persons, and it must be added, to persons of both parties; for there are suppressions of this nature in the account of Montrose as well as in that of Argyle. But we have not found any instance in which, like the editors of Clarendon in the account of Pym, they have deliberately kept back an important part of the defence of an opponent charged with an infamous crime.

The characteristic and amusing notes of Warburton, which are a new proof of his familiar acquaintance with the history of the Civil War, are no unimportant appendage to the new edition of Clarendon. He speaks of Henrietta Maria with a bitterness more unsuitable to his own station, than unjust towards that princess. The noble historian tells us with a cautious courtesy, which adds to the zest of the ironical passage which follows, that '*some persons in France were wonderfully fearful that the King should make his escape from Carisbrook.*' Warburton truly interprets these words as referring to '*the Queen, unwilling that the King should interrupt her commerce with Jermyn.*'† We are told by Clarendon, that '*the Queen was struck to the heart at the report of what the Parliament intended;*'—on which Warburton observes, '*She might well be so, when she had defeated the only means of preventing this dreadful catastrophe, by discouraging his rescue out of Carisbrook Castle,*'—a charge which, considering the motive imputed to her, and the calamitous condition of her affectionate and submissive husband, is perhaps the most heinous ever preferred against a wife. In another place, where Clarendon, if

\* Burton, 134.

† By whom she was believed to have had a child at Paris.

rightly understood by his annotator, throws out with insidious gravity a sarcasm of no very delicate sort, the Bishop holds out the naked truth in a plain and unepiscopal shape. 'He (Jermyn) was kept by the Queen.' For these services, Lord Jermyn, a little before the Restoration, was raised by Charles II. (as Lord Clarendon informs us), 'at the desire of his mother,' to the well-earned dignity of Earl of St Albans. \*

---

ART. II. 1. *The Gospel of St John, in Latin, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation.* Executed under the immediate direction of JAMES HAMILTON. London, 1824.

2. *The Gospel of St John, adapted to the Hamiltonian System, by an Analytical and Interlineary Translation from the Italian, with full Instructions for its Use, even by those who are wholly ignorant of the Language. For the Use of Schools.* By JAMES HAMILTON, Author of the Hamiltonian System. London, 1825.

WE have nothing whatever to do with Mr Hamilton personally. He may be the wisest or the weakest of men; most dexterous or most unsuccessful in the exhibition of his system; modest and proper, or prurient and preposterous in its commen-

---

\* The following curious note of Lord Dartmouth in the new edition of Burnett, vol i. p. 63, will show the constancy of Henrietta's attachment for twenty years to 'the wrong man.'

'Before the civil war, the Queen had a very particular aversion to the Duke of Hamilton, which he perceiving, prevailed with Mrs Seymour, who attended upon her in her bed-chamber, to let him into the Queen's private apartment at Somerset House, (the usual place for her retirement), where he surprised the Queen in great familiarities with Harry Jermyn; after which, she never durst refuse the Duke any thing he desired of her. This, Sir J. Compton told me he had from his mother the Countess of Northampton, who was very intimately acquainted with Mrs Seymour, that was afterwards drowned in shooting London bridge.'

The Court of Charles I., as it appears in the general representations of historians, might be thought a model of decorum and gravity; but wherever chance throws up a little corner of the curtain, we catch a glimpse of a very different scene. In the Sydney Papers (vol. ii. p. 472), to which our attention has lately been recalled by the curious addition made to them in Mr Blencowe's publication, we have an account of a conversation of that Prince with Lady Lei-

dation;—by none of these considerations is his system itself affected.

The proprietor of Ching's Lozenges must necessarily have recourse to a newspaper, to rescue from oblivion the merit of his vermifuge medicines. In the same manner, the Amboyna tooth-powder must depend upon the Herald and the Morning Post. Unfortunately, the system of Mr Hamilton has been introduced to the world by the same means, and has exposed itself to those suspicions which hover over splendid discoveries of genius, detailed in the daily papers, and sold in sealed boxes at an infinite diversity of prices,—but with a perpetual inclusion of the stamp, and with an equitable discount for undelayed payment.

It may have been necessary for Mr Hamilton to have had recourse to these means of making known his discoveries, since he may not have had friends whose names and authority might have attracted the notice of the public; but it is a misfortune to which his system has been subjected, and a difficulty which it has still to overcome. There is also a singular and somewhat ludicrous condition of giving *warranted lessons*; by which is meant, we presume, that the money is to be returned, if the progress is not made. We should be curious to know, how poor Mr Hamilton would protect himself from some swindling scholar, who, having really learnt all that the master professed to teach, should counterfeit the grossest ignorance of the Gospel of St John, and refuse to construe a single verse, or to pay a farthing?

Whether Mr Hamilton's translations are good or bad, is not the question. The point to determine is, whether very close interlineal translations are helps in learning a language? not whether Mr Hamilton has executed these translations faithfully and judiciously. Whether Mr Hamilton is or is not the inventor of the system which bears his name, and what his claims to originality may be, are also questions of very second-rate importance; but they merit a few observations. That man is not the discoverer of any art who first says the thing; but he who says it so long, and so loud, and so clearly, that he compels

---

cester, in presence of his Court, which shows an ungracious combination of his own reserved and embarrassed manners with the looseness and grossness of the age. A single instance of such scurvy jests, addressed by a king to a lady of the highest rank, in the presence of his court, and amidst their laughter, is sufficient to show that the King and the Royalists differed as widely from the Puritans, in their feelings of delicacy and refinement, as in their principles of religion and government.

mankind to hear him—the man who is so deeply impressed with the importance of the discovery that he will take no denial, but, at the risk of fortune and fame, pushes through all opposition, and is determined that what he thinks he has discovered shall not perish for want of a fair trial. Other persons had noticed the effect of coal-gas in producing light; but Winsor worried the town with bad English for three winters before he could attract any serious attention to his views. Many persons broke stone before Macadam, but Macadam felt the discovery more strongly, stated it more clearly, persevered in it with greater tenacity, wielded his hammer, in short, with greater force than other men, and finally succeeded in bringing his plan into general use.

Literal translations are not only not used in our public schools, but are generally discountenanced in them. A literal translation, or any translation of a school-book, is a contraband article in English schools, which a schoolmaster would instantly seize, as a customhouse officer would a barrel of gin. Mr Hamilton, on the other hand maintains, by books and lectures, that all boys ought to be allowed to work with literal translations, and that it is by far the best method of learning a language. If Mr Hamilton's system is just, it is sad trifling to deny his claim to originality, by stating that Mr Locke has said the same thing, or that others have said the same thing a century earlier than Hamilton. They have all said it so feebly, that their observations have passed *sub silentio*; and if Mr Hamilton succeeds in being heard and followed, to him be the glory,—because from him have proceeded the utility and the advantage.

The works upon this subject on this plan, published before the time of Mr Hamilton, are Montanus's Edition of the Bible, with Pignini's interlineary Latin version; Lubin's New Testament having the Greek interlined with Latin and German; Abbé L'Olivet's *Pensées de Cicéron*; and a French Work by the Abbé Radonvilliers, Paris 1768,—and Locke upon Education.

One of the first principles of Mr Hamilton is, to introduce very strict literal, interlinear translations, as aids to lexicons and dictionaries, and to make so much use of them as that the dictionary or lexicon will be for a long time little required. We will suppose the language to be the Italian, and the book selected to be the Gospel of St John. Of this Gospel Mr Hamilton has published a key, of which the following is an extract.

‘ 1 NEL principio era il Verbo, e il Verbo era  
*In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was*  
 appresso Dio, e il Verbo era Dio.  
*near to God, and the Word was God.*



‘ 2 Questo era nel principio appresso Dio.

*This was in the beginning near to God.*

‘ 3 Per mezzo di lui tutte le cose furon fatte: e senza di  
*By means of him all the things were made: and without of*

lui nulla fu fatto di ciò, che è stato fatto.

*him nothing was made of that, which is been made.*

‘ 4 In lui era la vita, e la vita era la luce degli uomini

*In him was the life, and the life was the light of the men:*

‘ 5 E la luce splende tra la tenebre, e le

*And the light shines among the darknesses, and the*

tenebre hanno non ammessa la.

*darknesses have not admitted her.*

‘ 6 Vi fu un uomo mandato da Dio che nomava si

*There was a man sent by God who did name himself*

Giovanni.

*John.*

‘ 7 Questi venne qual testimone, affin di rendere

*This came like as witness, in order of to render*

testimonianza alla luce, onde per mezzo di lui tutti

*testimony to the light, whence by mean of him all*

credesscro.

*might believe.*

In this way Mr Hamilton contends (and appears to us to contend justly), that the language may be acquired with much greater ease and despatch, than by the ancient method of beginning with grammar, and proceeding with the dictionary. We will presume at present, that the only object is to read, not to write, or speak Italian, and that the pupil instructs himself from the Key without a master, and is not taught in a class. We wish to compare the plan of finding the English word in such a literal translation, to that of finding it in dictionaries—and the method of ending with grammar, or of taking the grammar at an advanced period of knowledge in the language, rather than at the beginning. Every one will admit, that of all the disgusting labours of life, the labour of lexicon and dictionary is the most intolerable. Nor is there a greater object of compassion than a fine boy, full of animal spirits, set down in a bright sunny day, with an heap of unknown words before him, to be turned into English, before supper, by the help of a ponderous dictionary alone. The object in looking into a dictionary can only be, to exchange an unknown sound for one that is known. Now, it seems indisputable, that the sooner this exchange is made the better. The greater the number of such exchanges which can be made in a given time, the greater is the progress, the more abundant the *copia verborum* obtained by the scholar. Would it not be

of advantage if the dictionary at once opened at the required page, and if a self-moving index at once pointed to the requisite word? Is any advantage gained to the world by the time employed first in finding the letter P, and then in finding the three guiding letters P R I? This appears to us to be pure loss of time, justifiable only if it is inevitable: And even after this is done, what an infinite multitude of difficulties are heaped at once upon the wretched beginner! Instead of being reserved for his greater skill and maturity in the language, he must employ himself in discovering in which of many senses which his dictionary presents the word is to be used; in considering the case of the substantive, and the syntactical arrangement in which it is to be placed, and the relation it bears to other words. The loss of time in the merely mechanical part of the old plan is immense. We doubt very much, if an average boy, between ten and fourteen, will look out or find more than sixty words in an hour; we say nothing at present of the time employed in thinking of the meaning of each word when he has found it, but of the mere naked discovery of the word in the lexicon or dictionary. It must be remembered, we say an *average* boy,—not what Master Evans, the show-boy, can do, nor what Master Macarthy, the boy who is whipt every day, can do, but some boy between Macarthy and Evans; and not what this medium boy can do, while his mastigophorous superior is frowning over him; but what he actually does, when left in the midst of noisy boys, and with a recollection, that, by sending to the neighbouring shop, he can obtain any quantity of ripe gooseberries upon credit. Now, if this statement be true, and if there are 10,000 words in the Gospel of St John, here are 160 hours employed in the mere digital process of turning over leaves! But, in much less time than this, any boy of average quickness might learn, by the Hamiltonian method, to construe the whole four Gospels, with the greatest accuracy, and the most scrupulous correctness. The interlineal translation of course spares the trouble and time of this mechanical labour. Immediately under the Italian word is placed the English word. The unknown sound therefore is *instantly* exchanged for one that is known. The labour here spared is of the most irksome nature; and it is spared at a time of life the most averse to such labour: and so painful is this labour to many boys, that it forms an insuperable obstacle to their progress. They prefer to be flogged, or to be sent to sea. It is useless to say of any medicine that it is valuable, if it is so nauseous that the patient flings it away. You must give me, not the best medicine you have in your shop, but the best you can get me to take.

We have hitherto been occupied with finding the word; we will now suppose, after running a dirty finger down many columns, and after many sighs and groans, that the word is found. We presume the little fellow working in the true orthodox manner, without any translation: he is in pursuit of the Greek word *βαλλω*, and, after a long chase, seizes it, as greedily as a bailiff possesses himself of a fugacious captain. But, alas! the vanity of human wishes!—the never sufficiently to be pitied stripling has scarcely congratulated himself upon his success, when he finds *βαλλω* to contain the following meanings in Hederick's *Lexicon*:—1. Jacio; 2. Jaculor; 3. Ferio; 4. Figo; 5. Saucio; 6. Attingo; 7. Projicio; 8. Emitto; 9. Profundo; 10. Pono; 11. Immitto; 12. Trado; 13. Committo; 14. Condo; 15. Ædifico; 16. Verso; 17. Flecto. Suppose the little rogue, not quite at home in the Latin tongue, to be desirous of affixing English significations to these various words, he has then at the moderate rate of six meanings to every Latin word, one hundred and two meanings to the word *βαλλω*; or, if he is content with the Latin, he has then only seventeen. \*

Words, in their origin, have a natural or primary sense. The accidental associations of the people who use it, afterwards give to that word a great number of secondary meanings. In some words the primary meaning is very common, and the secondary meaning very rare. In other instances it is just the reverse; and in very many the particular secondary meaning is pointed out by some preposition which accompanies it, or some case by which it is accompanied. But an accurate translation points these things out gradually as it proceeds. The common and most probable meanings of the word *βαλλω*, or of any other word, are, in the Hamiltonian method, insensibly but surely fixed on the mind, which,

---

\* In addition to the other needless difficulties and miseries entailed upon children who are learning languages, their Greek Lexicons give a Latin, instead of an English translation; and a boy of twelve or thirteen years of age, whose attainments in Latin are of course but moderate, is expected to make it the vehicle of knowledge for other languages. This is setting the short-sighted and bear-eyed to lead the blind; and is one of those afflicting pieces of absurdity which escape animadversion, because they are, and have long been, of daily occurrence. Mr Jones has published an English and Greek Lexicon, which we recommend to the notice of all persons engaged in education, and not sacramented against all improvement.

by the Lexicon method, must be done by a tentative process, frequently ending in gross error, noticed with peevishness, punished with severity, consuming a great deal of time, and for the most part only corrected, after all, by the accurate *viva voce* translation of the master—or, in other words, by the Hamiltonian method.

The recurrence to a translation is treated, in our schools, as a species of imbecility and meanness; just as if there was any other dignity here than utility, any other object in learning languages, than to turn something you do not understand into something you do understand, and as if that was not the best method which effected this object in the shortest and simplest manner. Hear upon this point the judicious Locke. ‘ But if such a man cannot be got, who speaks good Latin, and being able to instruct your son in all these parts of knowledge, will undertake it by this method; the next best is to have him taught as near this way as may be—which is by taking some easy and pleasant book, such as *Æsop's Fables*, and writing the English translation (made as literal as it can be) in one line, and the Latin words which answer each of them just over it in another. These let him read every day over and over again, till he perfectly understands the Latin; and then go on to another fable, till he be also perfect in that, not omitting what he is already perfect in, but sometimes reviewing that, to keep it in his memory; and when he comes to write, let these be set him for copies, which, with the exercise of his hand, will also advance him in Latin. This being a more imperfect way than by talking Latin unto him, the formation of the verbs first, and afterwards the declensions of the nouns and pronouns perfectly learned by heart, may facilitate his acquaintance with the genius and manner of the Latin tongue, which varies the signification of verbs and nouns, not as the modern languages do, by particles prefixed, but by changing the last syllables. More than this of grammar I think he need not have, till he can read himself *Sanctii Minerva*—with *Sciopius* and *Perigonius's* notes,’—*Locke on Education*, p. 74. folio.

Another recommendation which we have not mentioned in the Hamiltonian system is, that it can be combined, and is constantly combined, with the system of Lancaster. The Key is probably sufficient for those who have no access to classes and schools: But in an Hamiltonian school during the lesson, it is not left to the option of the child to trust to the Key alone. The master stands in the middle, translates accurately and literally

the whole verse, and then asks the boys the English of separate words, or challenges them to join the words together, as he has done. A perpetual attention and activity is thus kept up. The master, or a scholar (turned into a temporary Lancasterian master) acts as a living lexicon; and, if the thing is well done, as a lively and animating lexicon. How is it possible to compare this with the solitary wretchedness of a poor lad of the desk and lexicon, suffocated with the nonsense of grammarians, overwhelmed with every species of difficulty disproportionate to his age, and driven by despair to peg, top, or marbles?

‘Taking these principles as a basis, the teacher forms his class of *eight, ten, twenty, or one hundred*. The number is of little moment, it being as easy to teach a greater as a smaller one, and brings them at once to the language itself, by reciting, with a loud articulate voice, the first verse, thus:—*In in, principio* in beginning, *Verbum* Word, *erat* was, *et* and, *Verbum* Word, *erat* was, *apud* at, *Deum* God, *et* and, *Verbum* word, *erat* was, *Deus* God. Having recited the verse once or twice himself, it is then recited *precisely* in the same manner by any person of the class whom he may judge most capable; the person copying his manner and intonations as much as possible.—When the verse has been thus recited, by *six or eight* persons of the class, the teacher recites the 2nd verse in the same manner, which is recited as the former by any members of the class; and thus continues until he has recited from *ten to twelve* verses, which usually constitute the first lesson of one hour.—In three lessons, the first Chapter may be thus readily translated, the teacher gradually diminishing the number of repetitions of the same verse till the *fourth* lesson; when each member of the class translates his verse in turn from the mouth of the teacher; from which period *fifty, sixty, or even seventy*, verses may be translated in the time of a lesson, or one hour. At the *seventh* lesson, it is invariably found that the class can translate without the assistance of the teacher farther than for occasional correction, and for those words which they may not have met in the preceding Chapters. But, to accomplish this, it is absolutely necessary that every member of the class know *every word* of all the preceding lessons; which is however an easy task, the words being always taught him in class, and the pupil besides being able to refer to the key whenever he is at a loss—the key being translated in the very words which the teacher has used in the class, from which, as was before remarked, he must never deviate.—In *ten* lessons, it will be found that the class can readily translate the whole of the Gospel of St. John, which is called the first section of the course.—Should any delay, from any cause, prevent them, it is in my classes always for account of teacher, who gives the extra lesson or lessons always *gratis*.—It cannot be too deeply impressed on the mind of the pupil, that a *perfect knowledge of every word* of his first section is most im-

portant to the ease and comfort of his future progress.—At the end of *ten* lessons, or first section, the custom of my Establishments is to give the pupil the *Epitome Historiæ Sacræ*, which is provided with a key in the same manner.—It was first used in our classes for the first and second sections; we now teach it in one section of *ten* lessons, which we find easier than to teach it in two sections before the pupil has read the Testament.—When he has read the *Epitome*, it will be then time to give him the theory of the verbs and other words which change their terminations.—He has already acquired a good practical knowledge of these things; the theory becomes then very easy.—A grammar containing the declensions and conjugations, and printed specially for my classes, is then put into the pupil's hands (not to be got by heart, nothing is ever got by rote on this system,) but that he may comprehend more readily his teacher who lectures on grammar generally, but especially on the verbs. From this time, that is, from the beginning of the *third* section, the pupil studies the theory and construction of the language as well as its practice. For this purpose he reads the ancient authors, beginning with *Cæsar*, which, together with the *Selecta e Profundis*, fills usefully the *third* and *fourth* sections. When these with the preceding books are well known, the pupil will find little difficulty in reading the authors usually read in schools. The *fifth* and *sixth* sections consist of *Virgil* and *Horace*, enough of which is read to enable the pupil to read them with facility, and to give him correct ideas of Prosody and Versification. Five or six months, with mutual attention on the part of pupil and teacher, will be found sufficient to acquire a knowledge of this language, which hitherto has *rarely* been the result of as many years.'

We have before said, that the Hamiltonian system must not depend upon Mr Hamilton's method of carrying it into execution; for instance, he banishes from his schools the effects of emulation. The boys do not take each other's places. This, we think, is a sad absurdity. A cook might as well resolve to make bread without fermentation, as a pedagogue to carry on a school without emulation. It must be a sad doughy lump without this vivifying principle. Why are boys to be shut out from a class of feelings to which society owes so much, and upon which their conduct in future life must (if they are worth any thing) be so closely constructed. Poet A writes verses to outshine poet B. Philosopher C sets up roasting Titanium, and boiling Chromium, that he may be thought more of than philosopher D. Mr Jackson strives to outpoint Sir Thomas; Sir Thomas Lethbridge to overspeak Mr Canning; and so society gains good chemists, poets, painters, speakers, and orators; and why are not boys to be emulous as well as men?

If a boy were in Paris, would he learn the language better

by shutting himself up to read French books with a dictionary, or by conversing freely with all whom he met? and what is conversation but an Hamiltonian school? Every man you meet is a living lexicon and grammar—who is perpetually changing your English into French, and perpetually instructing you, in spite of yourself, in the terminations of French substantives and verbs. The analogy is still closer, if you converse with persons of whom you can ask questions, and who will be at the trouble of correcting you. What madness would it be to run away from these pleasing facilities, as too dangerously easy—to stop your ears, to double-lock the door, and to look out *chickens, taking a walk, and fine weather*, in Boyer's Dictionary—and then, by the help of Chambaud's Grammar, to construct a sentence which should signify, '*Come to my house, and eat some chickens, if it is fine?*' But there is in England almost a love of difficulty and needless labour. We are so resolute and industrious in raising up impediments which ought to be overcome, that there is a sort of suspicion against the removal of these impediments, and a notion that the advantage is not fairly come by without the previous toil. If the English were in a paradise of spontaneous productions, they would continue to dig and plough, though they were never a peach nor a pine-apple the better for it.

A principal point to attend to in the Hamiltonian system, is the prodigious number of words and phrases which pass through the boy's mind, compared with those which are presented to him by the old plan. As a talkative boy learns French sooner in France than a silent boy, so a translator of books learns sooner to construe, the more he translates. An Hamiltonian makes, in six or seven lessons, three or four hundred times as many exchanges of English for French or Latin, as a grammar schoolboy can do; and if he loses 50 per cent. of all he hears, his progress is still, beyond all possibility of comparison, more rapid.

As for pronunciation of living languages, we see no reason why that consideration should be introduced in this place. We are decidedly of opinion, that all living languages are best learnt in the country where they are spoken, or by living with those who come from that country; but if that cannot be, Mr Hamilton's method is better than the grammar and dictionary method. *Ceteris paribus*, Mr Hamilton's method, as far as French is concerned, would be better in the hand of a Frenchman, and his Italian method in the hands of an Italian; but all this has nothing to do with the system.

' Have I read through Lilly ?—have I learnt by heart that ' most atrocious monument of absurdity, the Westminster Grammar ?—have I been whipt for the substantives ?—whipt ' for the verbs ?—and whipt for and with the interjections ?— ' Have I picked the sense slowly, and word by word, out of ' Hederick ?—and shall my son Daniel be exempt from all this ' misery ?—Shall a little unknown person in Cecil Street, Strand, ' No. 25, pretend to tell me that all this is unnecessary ?— ' Was it possible that I might have been spared all this ?—The ' whole system is nonsense, and the man an impostor. If there ' had been any truth in it, it must have occurred to some one ' else before this period.'—This is a very common style of observation upon Mr Hamilton's system, and by no means an uncommon wish of the mouldering and decaying part of mankind, that the next generation should not enjoy any advantages from which they themselves have been precluded.—*' Aye, aye, ' it's all mighty well—but I went through this myself, and I am ' determined my children shall do the same.'*—We are convinced that a great deal of opposition to improvement proceeds from this principle. Crabbe might make a good picture of an unbenevolent old man, slowly retiring from this sublunary scene, and lamenting that the coming race of men would be less bumped on the roads, better lighted in the streets, and less tormented with grammars and lexicons, than in the preceding age. A great deal of compliment to the wisdom of ancestors, and a great degree of alarm at the dreadful spirit of innovation, are soluble into mere jealousy and envy.

But what is to become of a boy who has no difficulties to grapple with ? How enervated will that understanding be, to which every thing is made so clear, plain, and easy ?—no hills to walk up, no chasms to step over ; every thing graduated, soft, and smooth. All this, however, is an objection to the multiplication table, to Napier's bones, and to every invention for the abridgment of human labour. There is no dread of any lack of difficulties. Abridge intellectual labour by any process you please—multiply mechanical powers to any extent—there will be sufficient, and infinitely more than sufficient, of laborious occupation for the mind and body of man. Why is the boy to be idle ?—By and by comes the book without a key ; by and by comes the lexicon. They do come at last—though at a better period. But if they did not come,—if they were useless, if language could be attained without them, would any human being wish to retain difficulties for their own sake, which led to nothing useful, and by the annihilation of which our fa-



culties were left to be exercised, by difficulties which *do* lead to something useful,—by mathematics, natural philosophy, and every branch of useful knowledge? Can any one be so insensuous as to suppose, that the faculties of young men cannot be exercised, and their industry and activity called into proper action, because Mr Hamilton teaches, in three or four years, what has (in a more vicious system) demanded seven or eight? Besides, even in the Hamiltonian method it is very easy for one boy to outstrip another. Why may not a clever and ambitious boy employ three hours upon his key by himself, while another boy has only employed one? There is plenty of corn to thrash, and of chaff to be winnowed away, in Mr Hamilton's system; the difference is, that every blow tells, because it is properly directed. In the old way, half their force was lost in air. There is a mighty foolish apothegm of Dr Bell's, that it is not what is done for a boy that is of importance, but what a boy does for himself. This is just as wise as to say, that it is not the breeches which are made for a boy that can cover his nakedness, but the breeches he makes for himself. All this entirely depends upon a comparison of the time saved, by showing the boy how to do a thing, rather than by leaving him to do it for himself. Let the object be, for example, to make a pair of shoes. The boy will effect this object much better if you show him how to make the shoes, than if you merely give him wax, thread, and leather, and leave him to find out all the ingenious abridgments of labour which have been discovered by experience. The object is to turn Latin into English. The scholar will do it much better and sooner if the word is found for him, than if he finds it—much better and sooner if you point out the effect of the terminations, and the nature of the syntax, than if you leave him to detect them for himself. The thing *is* at last done *by the pupil himself*—for he reads the language—which was the thing to be done. All the help he has received has only enabled him to make a more economical use of his time, and to gain his end sooner. Never be afraid of wanting difficulties for your pupil; if means are rendered more easy, more will be expected. The animal will be compelled, or induced to do all that he can do, M'Adam has made the roads better. Dr Bell would have predicted, that the horses would get too fat; but the actual result is, that they are compelled to go ten miles an hour instead of eight.

For teaching children, this too I think is to be observed, that, in most cases, where they stick, they are not to be farther puzzled, by putting them upon finding it out themselves;

‘ as by asking such questions as these, viz.—which is the nominative case in the sentence they are to construe? or demanding what “*aufero*” signifies, to lead them to the knowledge what “*abstulere*” signifies, &c. when they cannot readily tell. This wastes time only, in disturbing them; for whilst they are learning, and apply themselves with attention, they are to be kept in good humour, and every thing made easy to them, and as pleasant as possible. Therefore, wherever they are at a stand, and are willing to go forwards, help them presently over the difficulty, without any rebuke or chiding; remembering that, where harsher ways are taken, they are the effect only of pride and peevishness in the teacher, who expects children should instantly be masters of as much as he knows; whereas he should rather consider, that his business is to settle in them *habits*, not angrily to inculcate *rules*.’—*Locke on Education*, p. 74.

Suppose the first five books of Herodotus to be acquired by a key, or literal translation after the method of Hamilton, so that the pupil could construe them with the greatest accuracy;—we do not pretend, because the pupil could construe this book, that he could construe any other book equally easy; we merely say, that the pupil has acquired, by these means, a certain *copia verborum*, and a certain practical knowledge of grammar, which must materially diminish the difficulty of reading the next book; that his difficulties diminish in a compound ratio with every fresh book he reads with a key—till at last he reads any common book, without a key—and that he attains this last point of perfection in a time incomparably less, and with difficulties incomparably smaller, than in the old method.

There are a certain number of French books, which, when a boy can construe accurately, he may be said, for all purposes of reading, to be master of the French language. No matter how he has attained this power of construing the books. If you try him thoroughly, and are persuaded he is perfectly master of the books—then he possesses the power in question—he understands the language. Let these books, for the sake of the question, be *Telemachus*, the *History of Louis XIV.* the *Henriade*, the *Plays of Racine*, and the *Revolutions of Vertot*. We would have Hamiltonian keys to all these books, and the Lancasterian method of instruction. We believe these books would be mastered in one-sixth part of the time, by these means, that they would be by the old method, of looking out the words in the dictionary, and then coming to say the lesson to the master; and we believe that the boys, long before they came to the end of this

series of books, would be able to do without their keys,—to fling away their cork-jackets, and to swim alone. But boys who learn a language in four or five months, it is said, are apt to forget it again. Why, then, does not a young person, who has been five or six months in Paris, forget his French four or five years afterwards? It has been obtained without any of that labour, which the objectors to the Hamiltonian system deem to be so essential to memory. It has been obtained in the midst of tea and bread and butter, and yet is in a great measure retained for a whole life. In the same manner, the pupils of this new school use a colloquial living dictionary, and, from every principle of youthful emulation, contend with each other in catching the interpretation, and in applying to the lesson before them.

‘ If you wish boys to remember any language, make the acquisition of it very tedious and disgusting.’ This seems to be an odd rule: But if it is good for language, it must be good also for every species of knowledge—music, mathematics, navigation, architecture. In all these sciences aversion should be the parent of memory—impediment the cause of perfection. If difficulty is the sauce of memory, the boy who learns with the greatest difficulty will remember with the greatest tenacity;—in other words, the acquisitions of a dunce will be greater and more important than those of a clever boy. Where is the love of difficulty to end? Why not leave a boy to compose his own dictionary and grammar? It is not what is done for a boy, but what he does for himself, that is of any importance. Are there difficulties enough in the old method of acquiring languages? Would it be better if the difficulties were doubled, and thirty years given to languages, instead of fifteen? All these arguments presume the difficulty to be got over, and then the memory to be improved. But what if the difficulty is shrunk from? What if it puts an end to power, instead of increasing it; and extinguishes, instead of exciting, application? And when these effects are produced, you not only preclude all hopes of learning or language, but you put an end for ever to all literary habits, and to all improvements from study. The boy who is lexicon-struck in early youth, looks upon all books afterwards with horror, and goes over to the blockheads. Every boy would be pleased with books, and pleased with school, and be glad to forward the views of his parents, and obtain the praise of his master, if he found it possible to make tolerably easy progress; but he is driven to absolute despair by gerunds, and wishes himself dead! Progress is pleasure—activity is pleasure. It is impossible for a boy not to make progress, and not to be

active in the Hamiltonian method; and this pleasing state of mind we contend to be more favourable to memory, than the languid jaded spirit which much commerce with lexicons never fails to produce.

Translations are objected to in schools justly enough, when they are paraphrases, and not translations. It is impossible, from a paraphrase or very loose translation, to make any useful progress—they retard rather than accelerate a knowledge of the language to be acquired, and are the principal causes of the discredit into which translations have been brought, as instruments of education.

Infandum Regina jubes renovare dolorem,

Regina, jubes renovare dolorem infandum.

*Oh! Queen, thou orderest to renew grief not to be spoken of.*

‘ Oh! Queen, in pursuance of your commands, I enter upon the narrative of misfortunes almost too great for utterance. ’

The first of these translations leads us directly to the explanation of a foreign language, as the latter ensures a perfect ignorance of it.

It is difficult enough to introduce any useful novelty in education, without enhancing its perils by needless and untenable paradox. Mr Hamilton has made an assertion in his Preface to the Key of the Italian Gospel, which has no kind of foundation in fact, and which has afforded a conspicuous mark for the aim of his antagonists.

‘ I have said that each word is translated by its *one sole* undeviating meaning, assuming as an incontrovertible principle in all languages that, with very few exceptions, each word has one meaning only, and can usually be rendered correctly into another by one word only, which one word should serve for its representative at all times and on all occasions. ’

Now, it is probable that each word had one meaning only in its origin; but metaphor and association are so busy with human speech, that the same word comes to serve in a vast variety of senses, and continues to do so long after the metaphors and associations which called it into this state of activity, are buried in oblivion. Why may not *jubeo* be translated order, as well as command, or *dolorem* rendered *grief* as well as *sorrow*? Mr Hamilton has expressed himself loosely; but he perhaps means no more than to say, that in school translations, the metaphysical meaning should never be adopted, when the word can be rendered by its primary signification. We shall allow him, however, to detail his own method of making the translation in question.

‘ Translations on the Hamiltonian system, according to which this

book is translated, must not be confounded with translations made according to Locke, Clarke, Sterling, or even according to Dumasais, Fremont, and a number of other Frenchmen, who have made what have been and are yet sometimes called *literal*, and interlineal translations. The latter are indeed *interlineal*, but no *literal* translation had ever appeared in any language before those called Hamiltonian, that is before my Gospel of St John from the French, the Greek and Latin Gospels published in London, and L'Hommond's Epitome of the *Historia Sacra*. These and these only were and are truly literal; that is to say, that every word is rendered in English by a corresponding part of speech, that the grammatical analysis of the phrase is never departed from; that the case of every noun, pronoun, adjective or participle, and the mood, tense and person of every verb are accurately pointed out by appropriate and unchanging signs, so that a grammarian not understanding one word of Italian, would, on reading any part of the translation here given, be instantly able to parse it. In the translations above alluded to, an attempt is made to preserve the correctness of the language into which the different works are translated, but the wish to conciliate this correctness with a literal translation, has only produced a barbarous and uncouth idiom, while it has in every case deceived the unlearned pupil by a translation altogether false and incorrect. Such translations may indeed give an idea of what is contained in the book translated, but they will not assist, or at least very little, in enabling the pupil to make out the exact meaning of each word, which is the principal object of Hamiltonian translations. The reader will understand this better by an illustration: A gentleman has lately given a translation of Juvenal according to the plan of the above-mentioned authors, beginning with the words *semper ego*, which he joins and translates, "shall I always be"—if his intention were to teach Latin words, he might as well have said, "shall I always eat beef-steaks?"—True, there is nothing about beef-steaks in *semper ego*, but neither is there about "shall be;" the whole translation is on the same plan, that is to say, that there is not one line of it correct, I had almost said one word, on which the pupil can rely, as the exact equivalent in English of the Latin word above it.—Not so the translation here given.

'As the object of the author has been that the pupil should know every word as well as he knows it himself, he has uniformly given it the one sole, precise, meaning which it has in our language, sacrificing every where the beauty, the idiom and the correctness of the English language to the original, in order to show the perfect idiom, phraseology, and picture of that original as in a glass. So far is this carried, that where the English language can express the precise meaning of the Italian phrase only by a barbarism, this barbarism is employed without scruple—as thus: "e le tenebre non l'hanno am-messa."—Here the word *tenebre* being plural, if you translate it dark-

ness, you not only give a false translation of the word itself, which is used by the Italians in the plural number, but what is much more important, you lead the pupil into an error about its government, it being the nominative case to *hanno*, which is the third person plural ; it is therefore translated not darkness, but darknesses.

To make these keys perfect, we rather think there should be a free translation added to the literal one. Not a paraphrase, but only so free as to avoid any awkward or barbarous expression. The comparison between the free and the literal translation would immediately show to young people the peculiarities of the language in which they were engaged.

Literal translation or key—*Oh ! Queen, thou orderest me to renew grief not to be spoken of.*

Free—‘ *Oh Queen, thou orderest me to renew my grief, too great for utterance.* ’

The want of this accompanying free translation is not felt in keys of the Scriptures, because, in fact, the English Bible is a free translation, great part of which the scholar remembers. But in a work entirely unknown, of which a key was given, as full of awkward and barbarous expressions as a key certainly ought to be, a scholar might be sometimes puzzled to arrive at the real sense. We say as full of awkward and barbarous expressions as it ought to be, because we thoroughly approve of Mr Hamilton's plan, of always sacrificing English and elegance to sense, when they cannot be united in the key. We are rather sorry Mr Hamilton's first essay has been in a translation of the Scriptures, because every child is so familiar with them, that it may be difficult to determine whether the apparent progress is ancient recollection or recent attainment ; and because the Scriptures are so full of Hebraisms and Syriacisms, and the language so different from that of Greek authors, that it does not secure a knowledge of the language, equivalent to the time employed upon it.

The Keys hitherto published by Mr Hamilton are the Greek, Latin, French, Italian, and German Keys to the Gospel of St John, Perrin's Fables, Latin, *Historia Sacra*, Latin, French, and Italian Grammar, and *Studia Metrica*. One of the difficulties under which the system is labouring, is a want of more Keys. Some of the best Greek and Roman classics should be immediately published, with Keys, and by very good scholars. We shall now lay before our readers an extract from one of the public papers respecting the progress made in the Hamiltonian schools.

‘ *Extract from the Morning Chronicle of Wednesday, November*

16th, 1825.—*Hamiltonian System.*—We yesterday were present at an examination of eight lads who have been under Mr Hamilton since some time in the month of May last, with a view to ascertain the efficacy of his system in communicating a knowledge of languages. These eight lads, all of them between the ages of twelve and fourteen, are the children of poor people, who, when they were first placed under Mr Hamilton, possessed no other instruction than common reading and writing. They were obtained from a common country school, through the interposition of a Member of Parliament, who takes an active part in promoting charity schools throughout the country; and the choice was determined by the consent of the parents, and not by the cleverness of the boys.

‘ They have been employed in learning Latin, French, and latterly Italian; and yesterday they were examined by several distinguished individuals, among whom we recognised John Smith, Esq. M. P.; G. Smith, Esq. M. P.; Mr J. Mill, the historian of British India; Major Camac; Major Thompson; Mr Cowell, &c. &c. They first read different portions of the Gospel of St John in Latin, and of Cæsar’s Commentaries, selected by the visitors. The translation was executed with an ease which it would be in vain to expect in any of the boys who attend our common schools, even in their third or fourth year; and proved, that the principle of exciting the attention of boys to the utmost, during the process by which the meaning of the words is fixed in their memory, had given them a great familiarity with so much of the language as is contained in the books above alluded to. Their knowledge of the parts of speech was respectable, but not so remarkable; as the Hamiltonian system follows the natural mode of acquiring language, and only employs the boys in analysing, when they have already attained a certain familiarity with any language.

‘ The same experiments were repeated in French and Italian with the same success; and, upon the whole, we cannot but think the success has been complete. It is impossible to conceive a more impartial mode of putting any system to the test, than to make such an experiment on the children of our peasantry.’

Into the truth of this statement we have personally inquired, and it seems to us to have fallen short of the facts, from the laudable fear of over-stating them. The lads selected for the experiment were parish boys of the most ordinary description, reading English worse than Cumberland curates, and totally ignorant of the rudiments of any other language. They were purposely selected for the experiment by a gentleman who defrayed its expense, and who had the strongest desire to put strictly to the test the efficacy of the Hamiltonian system. The experiment was begun the middle of May 1825, and concluded on the day of November in the same year mentioned in the extract, exactly six

months after. The Latin books set before them were the Gospel of St John, and parts of Cæsar's Commentaries. Some Italian book or books (what we know not), and a selection of French histories. The visitors put the boys on where they pleased, and the translation was (as the reporter says) executed with an ease which it would be vain to expect in any of the boys who attend our common schools, even in their third or fourth year. †

From experiments and observations which have fallen under our own notice, we do not scruple to make the following assertions. If there were Keys to the four Gospels, as there is to that of St John, any boy or girl of thirteen years of age, and of moderate capacity, studying four hours a day, and beginning with an utter ignorance even of the Greek character, would learn to construe the four Gospels, with the most perfect and scrupulous accuracy, in six weeks. Some children, utterly ignorant of French or Italian, would learn to construe the four Gospels, in either of these languages, in three weeks; the Latin in four weeks; the German in five weeks. We believe they would do it in a class; but, not to run any risks, we will presume a master to attend upon one student alone for these periods. We assign a master principally, because the application of a solitary boy at that age could not be depended upon; but if the sedulity of the child were certain, he would do it nearly as well alone. A greater time is allowed for German and Greek, on account of the novelty of the character. A person of mature habits, eager and energetic in his pursuits, and reading seven or eight hours per day, might, though utterly ignorant of a letter of Greek, learn to construe the four Gospels, with the most punctilious accuracy, in three weeks, by the Key alone. These assertions we make, not of the Gospels alone, but of any tolerably easy book of the same extent. We mean to be very accurate; but suppose we are wrong—add 10, 20, 30 per cent. to the time, an average boy of thirteen, in an average school, cannot construe the four Gospels in two years from the time of his beginning the language.

All persons would be glad to read a foreign language, but all persons do not want the same scrupulous and comprehensive knowledge of grammar which a great Latin scholar possesses. Many persons may, and do derive great pleasure and

---

† We have left with the bookseller the names of two gentlemen who have verified this account to us, and who were present at the experiment. Their names will at once put an end to all scepticism as to the fact. Two more candid and enlightened judges could not be found.



instruction from French, German, and Italian books, who can neither speak nor write these languages—who know that certain terminations, when they see them, signify present or past time, but who, if they wished to signify present or past time, could not recall these terminations. For many purposes and objects, therefore, very little grammar is wanting.

The Hamiltonian method begins with what all persons want, a facility of construing, and leaves every scholar to become afterwards as profound in grammar as he (or those who educate him) may choose; whereas the old method aims at making all more profound grammarians than three-fourths wish to be, or than nineteen-twentieths *can* be. One of the enormous follies of the enormously foolish education in England, is, that all young men—dukes, fox-hunters, and merchants—are educated as if they were to keep a school, and serve a curacy; while scarcely an hour in the Hamiltonian education is lost for any variety of life. A grocer may learn enough of Latin to taste the sweets of Virgil; a cavalry officer may read and understand Homer, without knowing that *inus* comes from *in* with a smooth breathing, and that it is formed by an improper reduplication. In the mean time, there is nothing in that education which prevents a scholar from knowing (if he wishes to know) what Greek compounds draw back their accents. He may trace verbs in *inu*, from polysyllables in *in*, or derive endless glory from marking down derivatives in *πτω*, changing the *σ* of their primitives into *iota*.

Thus, in the Hamiltonian method, a good deal of grammar necessarily impresses itself upon the mind (*chemin faisant*), as it does in the vernacular tongue, without any rule at all, and merely by habit. How is it possible to read many Latin Keys, for instance, without remarking, willingly or unwillingly, that the first persons of verbs end in *o*, the second in *s*, the third in *t*?—that the same adjective ends in *us* or *a*, accordingly, as the connected substantive is masculine or feminine, and other such gross and common rules? An Englishman who means to say, *I will go to London*, does not say, *I could go to London*. He never read a word of grammar in his life; but he has learnt, by habit, that the word *go*, signifies to proceed or set forth, and by the same habit he learns that future intentions are expressed by *I will*; and by the same habit the Hamiltonian pupil, reading over, and comprehending twenty times more words and phrases than the pupil of the ancient system, insensibly but infallibly fixes upon his mind many rules of grammar. We are far from meaning to say, that the grammar thus acquired will be sufficiently accurate for a first-rate Latin and Greek scholar; but there is

no reason why a young person arriving at this distinction, and educated in the Hamiltonian system, may not carry the study of grammar to any degree of minuteness and accuracy. The only difference is, that he begins grammar as a study, after he has made a considerable progress in the language, and not before,—a very important feature in the Hamiltonian system, and a very great improvement in the education of children.

The imperfections of the old system proceed in a great measure from a bad and improvident accumulation of difficulties, which must all perhaps, though in a less degree, at one time or another be encountered, but which may be, and in the Hamiltonian system are, much more wisely distributed. A boy who sits down to Greek with lexicon and grammar, has to master an unknown character of an unknown language—to look out words in a lexicon, in the use of which he is inexpert—to guess, by many trials, in which of the numerous senses detailed in the lexicon he is to use the word—to attend to the inflexions of cases and tense—to become acquainted with the syntax of the language—and to become acquainted with these inflexions and this syntax from books written in foreign languages, and full of the most absurd and barbarous terms, and this at the tenderest age, when the mind is utterly unfit to grapple with any great difficulty; and the boy, who revolts at all this folly and absurdity, is set down for a dunce, and must go into a marching regiment, or on board a man of war! The Hamiltonian pupil has his word looked out for him, its proper sense ascertained, the case of the substantive, the inflexions of the verb pointed out, and the syntactical arrangement placed before his eyes. Where, then, is he to encounter these difficulties? Does he hope to escape them entirely? Certainly not, if it is his purpose to become a great scholar; but he will enter upon them when the character is familiar to his eye—when a great number of Greek words are familiar to his eye and ear—when he has practically mastered a great deal of grammar—when the terminations of verbs convey to him different modifications of time, the terminations of substantives different varieties of circumstance—when the rules of grammar in short are a confirmation of previous observation, not an irksome multitude of directions, heaped up without any opportunity of immediate application.

The real way of learning a dead language, is to imitate as much as possible the method in which a living language is naturally learnt. When do we ever find a well educated Englishman or Frenchman embarrassed by an ignorance of the grammar of their respective languages? They first learn

it practically and unerringly; and then, if they choose to look back, and smile at the idea of having proceeded, by a number of rules without knowing one of them, by heart, or being conscious that they had any rule at all, this is a philosophical amusement: But who ever thinks of learning the grammar of their own tongue before they are very good grammarians? Let us hear what Mr Locke says upon this subject:—  
 ' If grammar ought to be taught at any time, it must be to one that can speak the language already; how else can he be taught the grammar of it? This at least is evident, from the practice of the wise and learned nations amongst the ancients. They made it a part of education to cultivate their own, not foreign languages. The Greeks counted all other nations barbarous, and had a contempt for their languages. And, though the Greek learning grew in credit amongst the Romans towards the end of their commonwealth, yet it was the Roman tongue that was made the study of their youth; their own language they were to make use of, and therefore it was their own language they were instructed and exercised in.

' But, more particularly, to determine the proper season for grammar, I do not see how it can reasonably be made any one's study, but as an introduction to rhetoric. When it is thought time to put any one upon the care of polishing his tongue, and of speaking better than the illiterate, then is the time for him to be instructed in the rules of grammar, and not before. For grammar being to teach men, not to speak, but to speak correctly, and according to the exact rules of the tongue, which is one part of elegance, there is little use of the one to him that has no need of the other. Where rhetoric is not necessary, grammar may be spared. I know not why any one should waste his time, and beat his head about the Latin grammar, who does not intend to be a critic, or make speeches, and write dispatches in it. When any one finds in himself a necessity or disposition to study any foreign language to the bottom, and to be nicely exact in the knowledge of it, it will be time enough to take a grammatical survey of it. If his use of it be only to understand some books writ in it, without a critical knowledge of the tongue itself, reading alone, as I have said, will attain that end, without charging the mind with the multiplied rules and intricacies of grammar.'—*Locke on Education*, p. 78, folio.

In the *Éton Grammar*, the following very plain and elementary information is conveyed to young gentlemen utterly ignorant of every syllable of the language.

' Nomina anomala quæ contrahuntur sunt, Ὀλοπαβῆ, quæ contra-

huntur in omnibus, ut γὰρ γῆς, &c. Ολιγοπαθή, quæ in paucioribus casibus contrahuntur, ut substantiva Barytonia in ὕψ. Imparyllatrim in ὕψ, &c. &c.

From the Westminster Grammar we make the following extract—and some thousand rules, conveyed in poetry of equal merit, must be fixed upon the mind of the youthful Grecian, before he advances into the interior of the language.

- ‘ ω finis thematis finis utriusque futuri est
- ‘ Post liquidam in primo, vel in unoquoque secundo,
- ‘ ω circumflexum est. Ante ω finale character
- ‘ Explicitus σ᾽ primi est implicitusque futuri
- ‘ ω itaque in quo σ quasi plexum est solitu in σω.’

*Westminster Greek Grammar, 1814.*

Such are the easy initiations of our present methods of teaching. The Hamiltonian system, on the other hand, 1. teaches an unknown tongue by the closest interlinear translation, instead of leaving a boy to explore his way by the lexicon or dictionary. 2. It postpones the study of grammar till a considerable progress has been made in the language, and a great degree of practical grammar has been acquired. 3. It substitutes the cheerfulness and competition of the Lancasterian system for the dull solitude of the Dictionary. By these means, a boy finds he is making a progress, and learning something from the very beginning. He is not overwhelmed with the first appearance of insuperable difficulties; he receives some little pay from the first moment of his apprenticeship, and is not compelled to wait for remuneration till he is out of his time. The student having acquired the great art of understanding the sense of what is written in another tongue, may go into the study of the language as deeply and as extensively as he pleases. The old system aims at beginning with a depth and accuracy which many men never will want, which disgusts many from arriving even at moderate attainments, and is a less easy, and not more certain road to a profound skill in languages, than if attention to grammar had been deferred to a later period.

In fine, we are strongly persuaded, that the time being given, this system will make better scholars; and the degree of scholarship being given, a much shorter time will be needed. If there is any truth in this, it will make Mr Hamilton one of the most useful men of his age; for if there is any thing which fills reflecting men with melancholy and regret, it is the waste of mortal time, parental money, and puerile happiness, in the present method of pursuing Latin and Greek.

ART. III.—*The late Crisis in the Money Market Impartially considered.* London, 1826.

**T**HERE is certainly no subject on which it is of more importance that the public should be well informed, than the causes of those sudden and ruinous revulsions which occasionally occur in highly commercial and manufacturing countries, and involve thousands in bankruptcy and ruin. Important, however, as this knowledge undoubtedly is, it has hitherto been very little attended to. It is rather mortifying to know, that the severe revulsion we have so lately experienced, and from the effects of which we shall long continue to suffer, was wholly unexpected by the vast majority of our merchants and manufacturers: and, even since it has taken place, a very great discrepancy of opinion has been entertained with respect to the causes to which it should be ascribed. Under these circumstances we are sure we shall be excused for availing ourselves of this opportunity, to submit a few observations on the subject.

In entering on this investigation, it is necessary to distinguish between those revulsions which depend on political contingencies, and may therefore be considered as in some measure accidental, and those which arise from the miscalculation of individuals, or from some defect in the system under which the industry of any given country is conducted. The causes of the former are plainly beyond the sphere of the Economist. It is his business to determine what course a government *ought*, under any given circumstances, to adopt with a view to the increase of the public wealth; but it is impossible for him to say *a priori* what it *will* adopt. He can neither divine its measures, nor warn those who may be injuriously affected by them, of the approaching danger. We do not, therefore, mean to make any observations on such revulsions as are the immediate effect either of the measures of foreign governments, or of our own; but to confine ourselves exclusively to those which take place in the ordinary course of affairs, and which recent experience has shown may be as sudden and violent as any that could be occasioned by the breaking out of a war, or the occurrence of a great revolution.

This class of revulsions have their origin either, *first*, in the miscalculations of those who are engaged in the production of commodities; or, *second*, in the miscalculations of the merchants who deal in them; or, *third*, in a fluctuation of prices,

caused by a sudden change in the quantity, and, consequently, in the value of money. We shall take the liberty to submit a few observations on each of these heads.

I. With respect to the *first* class of revulsions, or those which are caused by the miscalculations of the producers, they generally originate in some derangement of the usual proportion between the supply and demand of certain species of commodities. Suppose, for example, that, owing either to the opening of new markets, to a change of fashion, or to any other cause, the demand for cotton goods were considerably increased:—The consequences of such increased demand would be, that the price of cottons would immediately rise, and that the manufacturers would obtain comparatively high profits. But the rate of profits in different employments has a constant tendency to equality; and it can never, unless when monopolies interfere to prevent or counteract the operation of the principle of competition, continue for any considerable period either higher or lower in one than in the rest. As soon, therefore, as this rise in the price of cottons had taken place, additional capital would begin to be employed in their production. The manufacturers already engaged in the cotton trade would endeavour to borrow fresh capital; while a number of those engaged in other businesses, would withdraw from them, and enter into it. Unluckily, however, it is next to certain that this transference of capital would not stop at the point when it would suffice to produce the additional supply at the old prices, but that it would be carried so much farther as to produce a glut of cottons, and a ruinous revulsion. A variety of causes conspire to produce this effect:—The advantages which any one class of producers derive from an increased demand for their peculiar produce, are uniformly exaggerated, as well by that portion of themselves who are anxious, in order to improve their credit, to magnify their gains, as by the whole body of those who are engaged in other businesses. The adventurous and sanguine—those who are particularly disposed to take *omne ignotum pro magnifico*—crowd into a business which they readily believe presents the shortest and safest road to wealth and consideration; at the same time that many of that generally numerous class, who have their capitals lent to others, and who are waiting until a favourable opportunity occurs for investing them in some industrious undertaking, are tempted to follow the same course. It occurs to few, that the same causes that impel one to enter into a department that is yielding comparatively high profits, are most

probably impelling thousands. Confident in his own good fortune, the adventurer leaves a business to which he had been bred, and with which he was well acquainted, to enter as a competitor on a new and untried arena, while those who are already engaged in the advantageous business, stretch their credit to the utmost, in order to acquire the means of extending their concerns, and of increasing the supply of the commodity in unusual demand. The result, that every unprejudiced observer would anticipate, almost invariably takes place. A disproportionate quantity of capital being attracted to the lucrative business, a glut of the market, and a ruinous depression of prices, unavoidably follow.

Every merchant must be aware of the truth of what we have now stated. And such of our readers as will investigate the history of industry, either in this or any other country, will find, that a period of *peculiar* prosperity in any one branch, is the uniform harbinger of mischief. If we turn, for example, to the history of agriculture, the alternation between periods of high prices and great agricultural prosperity, and of low prices and great agricultural distress, is so striking, that it cannot fail to arrest the attention of every one. The high prices of 1800 and 1801 gave a most extraordinary stimulus to agricultural industry. Nearly *double* the number of acts of Parliament were passed in 1802 for the enclosure and drainage of land, that had been passed in any previous year. A great extent of old grass fields was at the same time subjected to the plough. And in consequence of this extension of cultivation, and of the other improvements that were then entered upon and completed, the supply of corn was so much increased in 1804, that prices sunk considerably below the common level; and an act was then passed, in consequence of the representations made by the agriculturists of their distressed condition, granting them additional protection against foreign competition. The high prices of 1810, 1811, 1812, and 1813, had a precisely similar result. They attracted so much additional capital to the land, and occasioned such an extension of tillage, that we grew in 1812 and 1813 an adequate supply of corn for our own consumption. And it is certain, that, under such circumstances, the price of corn must inevitably have fallen, in consequence of the unusually abundant harvest of 1814, though the ports had been entirely shut against importation from abroad.\*

---

\* The following Table, extracted from the official accounts laid before Parliament, of the average price of wheat in England and Wales, and the number of enclosure bills passed each year from

The history of the West India trade may also be referred to as affording the most convincing proofs of the truth of this principle. The devastation of St Domingo by the Negro insurrection, which broke out in 1792, by first diminishing, and in a very few years entirely annihilating, the supply of about 115,000 hhds. of sugar, which France and the Continent had previously drawn from that island, occasioned an extraordinary rise of prices, and gave a proportional encouragement to cultivation in the other islands. So powerful was its influence in this respect, that Jamaica, which, on an average of the six years preceding 1799, had exported only 83,000 hhds., exported in 1801 and 1802 upwards of 286,000, or 143,000 a year! But the duration of this prosperity was as brief as it was signal. The same rise of price which had produced such effects in the British islands, occasioned a similar, though less rapid, extension of cultivation in the colonies of the Continental powers. The increased supplies of sugar and coffee that were in consequence obtained from Cuba, Porto-Rico, Martinique, Guadaloupe, Brazil, &c. became, in no very long time, not only sufficient to

1791 to 1820, both inclusive, sets the principle we have been endeavouring to elucidate in the clearest point of view. The stimulus given by a high price one year to the extension of cultivation in the next, as evinced in the increased number of enclosure acts, is uniform and striking.

Years.	Average Price of Wheat per Quarter.		No. of Enclosure Acts.	Years.	Average Price of Wheat per Quarter.		No. of Enclosure Acts.
	s.	d.			s.	d.	
1791	47	2	38	1806	79	0	71
2	42	11		7	73	3	76
3	48	11		8	79	0	91
4	51	8		9	95	7	92
5	74	2		10	106	2	122
6	77	1	75	11	94	6	107
7	53	1	86	12	125	5	133
8	50	3	52	13	108	9	119
9	67	6	65	14	73	11	120
1800	113	7	63	15	64	4	81
1	118	3	80	16	75	10	47
2	67	5	122	17	94	9	34
3	56	6	96	18	84	1	46
4	60	1	104	19	73	0	44
5	87	10	52	1820	65	7	40



fill up the vacuum caused by the cessation of the supplies from St Domingo, but actually to overload the market. The great foreign demand for British plantation sugar, which had been experienced after the destruction of the St Domingo trade, gradually diminished until 1805 and 1806, when it almost entirely ceased; and the whole extra quantity raised, in consequence of this demand, being thrown on the home market, its price, which had been 66s. per cwt. in 1798, exclusive of duty, fell in 1806 to 34s.—a price which the Committee, that was then appointed by the House of Commons to inquire into the distresses of the planters, state, was not only insufficient to yield them any profit, but even to indemnify them for their actual outlay! And, we may add, that, owing to the ill-advised measures that were soon after adopted for creating a forced and unnatural demand for sugar, its supply was prevented from being diminished in proportion to the diminution of the effective demand; so that, some short intervals only excepted, the planters have ever since been involved in distress and difficulties.

The history of the silk-trade, of distillation, \* and, indeed, of every branch of industry, furnishes but too many proofs of the constant operation of this principle of compensation. The greater and more signal the peculiar prosperity of any one department, the greater infallibly is the subsequent recoil. Such an increased demand for any commodity, as would raise its price 10 per cent. above its common level, would certainly cause it to be produced in excess, and would in consequence occasion a revulsion. But were the price to rise 30 or 40 per cent. above the common level, the temptation to invest additional capital in it would be so very great, that the revulsion would both take place sooner, and be incomparably more severe.

The revulsions to which we have now alluded will necessarily continue to occur, to a greater or less extent, under any system of public economy. But there is nothing that would tend so much to lessen their frequency and violence as the establishment of a perfectly free intercourse with other countries, and the withholding of all relief, on the part of Government, from

---

\* The Scotch distillers are at this moment involved in serious difficulties, in consequence of their being unable to dispose of the greatly increased quantity of spirits they had produced in anticipation of the augmented English demand, which, it was supposed, would follow (and which has indeed followed, though not to the extent anticipated) the late reduction of the duties on spirits consumed in England, and the introduction of whisky into that part of the empire.

those who enter upon any improvident speculation. Were a perfectly free intercourse with other countries established, we should engage only in those branches of industry, for the prosecution of which we had some natural or acquired advantage; and which would, for that very reason, be in a great measure secured against those unfavourable contingencies that are always affecting such branches as are fenced round with restrictions. Suppose, to illustrate this principle, that a really free trade were established in silks: We should, under such circumstances, export a part of all those mixed fabrics of wool and silk, and of gloves and hosiery, in the production of which we have an advantage, to foreign countries, at the same time that a considerable part of our demand for other descriptions of silk goods would be supplied from them: If, on the one hand, therefore, the demand for silks should, in consequence of a change of fashion, or of any other cause, suddenly increase, the competition of the foreign manufacturers would prevent prices attaining any very extravagant height, and would thereby prevent both the inordinate extension of the manufacture and the subsequent recoil: And if, on the other hand, the demand for silks in this country happened to decline, the various foreign markets to which our manufacturers would then be accustomed to resort, would enable them to dispose of their surplus goods at a comparatively small reduction of price, to what must necessarily take place when they are restricted, as has hitherto been the case, to the home market.

We do not know whether this will be called theoretical reasoning; but we are quite sure that it is consistent with the most comprehensive experience. There is not a merchant in London who is not ready to admit, that fluctuations in the price of corn would be very much diminished, and the condition of the agriculturists rendered infinitely more secure, were the restrictions on the corn trade abolished. But this is a principle that does not hold in one trade only, but in *all*. Restrictions and prohibitions are, in every instance, productive of uncertainty and fluctuation. Every artificial stimulus, whatever, may be its momentary effect on the department of industry to which it is applied, is immediately disadvantageous to others, and ultimately ruinous to that which it was intended to promote. No arbitrary regulation, no act of the Legislature, can add any thing to the capital of the country; it can only force it into artificial channels. Besides, after a sufficient supply of capital has flowed into these channels, a *reaction* must commence. There can be no foreign vent for their surplus produce; and, whenever any change of fashion, or fluctuation in the taste of the consumers, occasions a falling off in the demand, the warehouses

are sure to be filled with commodities which, in a state of freedom, would never have been produced. The ignorant and the interested always ascribe such gluts to the employment of machinery, or to the want of sufficient protection against foreign competition ! The truth is, however, that they are the necessary and inevitable result of acting on an artificial and exclusive system ; and of the application of those poisonous nostrums, by which the natural and healthy state of the public economy is vitiated and deranged.

It will be observed, that the foregoing remarks apply only to the case of an excessive production in some particular branch of industry. We have, on several previous occasions, endeavoured to show, that an universal glut of all sorts of commodities is quite impossible. Indeed, the very idea of such a glut involves a contradiction and an absurdity. It is admitted on all hands, that however much the powers of production may be increased, such commodities as are produced in the view of being directly consumed by their producers, without the intervention of an exchange, can never be in excess ;—for to suppose that *they* should be in excess, would really be to suppose a production without a motive—an effect without a cause ! It is only when commodities are carried to market, and offered in exchange for others, that they can be in excess. But such commodities as are carried to market, are produced only in the view of obtaining others in exchange for them ; and the fact, that any description of them is in excess, is of itself an unanswerable proof that there is a corresponding deficiency in the supply of those they were intended to exchange for, or buy. The fault is not in a too great aggregate production ; but in producing particular commodities, which are either not in demand by those to whom we wish to sell them, or which we cannot ourselves consume. If we attend to these two grand requisites—if we produce such commodities only as can be taken off by those to whom we offer them for sale, or such as are directly available to our own use, we may increase the powers of production ten, or ten thousand times, and we shall be quite as free of all excess as if we diminished them in the same ratio. A glut invariably originates in the circumstance of those who are engaged in a particular business having increased the supply of their peculiar produce beyond its due proportion. The distresses of the West India planters in 1807, of the agriculturists in 1816, and, more recently, of the silk manufacturers, were all a consequence of their having added disproportionately to the quantity of their peculiar produce. It was this that sunk its value as compared with other things, the supply of which

had been more carefully adjusted to the effectual demand, and involved the producers in difficulties.

Besides establishing a system of free trade, the next best thing that could be done to avoid the chances of gluts, or of improvident production in particular departments, would be a determination on the part of Government to withhold all relief, except in cases of extreme necessity, from those who have had the misfortune to be involved in them. We acknowledge that this seems, at first sight, rather a harsh doctrine; but we are satisfied that, on examination, it will be found to be the only safe and really practicable line of conduct for the government of a great country to follow. Almost all the restrictions and prohibitions which now fetter our commerce, and restrict the spirit of enterprise, have been occasioned by Government stepping out of its proper province, and interfering for the relief of those who had got themselves entangled in difficulties. By this means, a very large proportion of the industry of the country has been placed on an insecure foundation; and merchants and manufacturers have been delivered from that natural responsibility under which every man ought to act, and been tempted to trust to the extrinsic support usually afforded by Government in the event of their speculations giving way. Were it possible, indeed, to grant such assistance without inflicting a real injury on the rest of the community, none would object to it; but, as this cannot be done, we confess it appears to us, not only that sound policy, but also that real humanity would dictate the propriety of its being withheld in all but extreme cases. We are glad too to be able to state, that this line of policy is sanctioned by the highest practical authority—by that of a gentleman who, if not at the very head, certainly ranks in the foremost class of mercantile men. In his able pamphlet on the Orders in Council, published in 1808, Mr Alexander Baring has expressed himself on this subject as follows:—‘The only beneficial care a government can take of commerce, is to afford it general protection in time of war, to remove by treaties the restrictions of foreign governments in time of peace, and cautiously to abstain from any, however plausible, of its own creating. If every law of regulation, either of our internal or external trade, were repealed, with the exception of those necessary for the collection of the revenue, it would be an undoubted benefit to commerce, as well as to the country at large. An avowed system of leaving things to take their own course, and of not listening to the interested solicitations of one class or another for relief, whenever the imprudence of speculation has occasioned

‘ losses, would, sooner than any artificial remedy, reproduce that equilibrium of demand and supply, which the ardour of gain will frequently derange, but which the same cause will, when let alone, as infallibly restore.

‘ The interference of the political regulator in these cases, is not only a certain injury to the other classes of the community, but generally so to that in whose favour it is exercised. If too much sugar be manufactured in Jamaica, or too much cotton in Manchester, the loss of those concerned will soon correct the mischief; but if forced means are devised to provide for the former a temporary increase of demand, which cannot be permanently secured, a recurrence to that natural state of fair profit, which is most to be desired by the planter, is artificially prevented by the very means intended for his relief. And if the cotton manufacturer, on the other hand, is to have his imprudences relieved at the expense of those employed on linen, silk, wool, or other materials, the injustice, as well as the impolicy of such a remedy, need no illustration.

‘ Whenever the assistance of Government is called for by any class of traders or manufacturers, it is usual to make the most splendid display of the importance of that particular branch to the nation at large. The West and East India interests, the ship-owners, the manufacturers, the American merchants, &c. have all the means of making these brilliant representations; but it should be recollected, that the interest of the State consists in the prosperity of the whole; that it is contrary to sound policy to advance one beyond its natural means, and still more to do so at the expense of others; and that the only mode of ascertaining the natural limits of each, is to leave them all alone.’ \*

Without attempting to weaken the force of the conclusive observations we have now quoted by any farther remarks of our own, or by any reference to Mr B.’s late appearances in the House of Commons, we shall now dismiss this branch of our subject, and proceed to the consideration of the *second*, or to an examination of the causes of those revulsions which proceed from *mercantile* miscalculation, or, as it is more commonly, though less correctly termed, from over-trading, or over-speculation.

II. Over-trading may either take place when the currency is at its proper level, and when it rests on a secure foundation; or it may take place when the currency is in excess, and when

---

\* An Inquiry into the Causes and Consequences of the Orders in Council, 1st Ed. p. 133.

it is inadequately secured, and when, consequently, it is liable to sudden fluctuations in its amount and value.

1. With respect to that over-trading which occasionally takes place when the currency is at its proper level, it may arise from a variety of causes. If a falling off were either apprehended, or had actually taken place in the accustomed supply of any commodity in general demand, or if any new and extensive markets were suddenly opened, there would undoubtedly be a greatly increased speculative demand for the articles that were supposed to be deficient in quantity, or that were understood to be suitable for the newly opened markets. This increased demand would occasion a rise of prices; and from the eagerness with which speculators crowd upon such occasions into the market, there is an extreme probability that prices would be raised beyond the proper level, and that there would be a dangerous recoil.

But the great hazard to which those who offer an unusually high price for any species of commodities, in the contemplation of a further advance, are exposed, depends on the difficulty of ascertaining the true state of the fact with respect to the grounds on which a deficient supply, or an increased demand, is anticipated. This, however, is evidently a practical question for the solution of the merchant, whose skill and sagacity are chiefly to be tried by the dexterity and success with which he conducts his business under such circumstances. The late cotton speculation, for example, took its rise, partly and chiefly from a supposed deficiency in the supply of cotton, partly from an idea that there was a greatly increased demand for raw cotton in this country and the Continent, and partly from a belief that the stocks on hand were unusually low. Now, it is plain that the success of those who embarked in this speculation must have depended entirely on two circumstances;—in the *first* place, that they were correct in the fundamental supposition, on which the whole speculation rested,—that the supply of cotton was no longer commensurate with the demand; and, *second*, that their competition did not raise the price so high as to diminish the consumption by the manufacturers in too great a degree to enable them to take off the quantity to be actually brought to market. If the merchants had been well-founded in their suppositions, and if their competition had not raised the price of cotton too high, the speculation would certainly have been successful. But, instead of being well-founded, the hypothesis on which the whole thing rested was perfectly visionary. There was no deficiency in the supply of cotton, but, on the contrary, a great superabundance; and though there had been such a deficiency, the excess to which the price was

carried must have checked consumption so much, as to have occasioned a ruinous decline. ‡

‡ We subjoin an official account of the imports of cotton wool into Great Britain and Ireland in the years 1823, 1824, and 1825, specifying the countries whence the imports were made, the quantities imported from each, and the total quantities re-exported to foreign countries.

Countries from which Imported.	Years ending 5th January		
	1824.	1825.	1826.
	<i>lbs.</i>	<i>lbs.</i>	<i>lbs.</i>
Portugal - - -	1,384,193	230,060	1,773,628
Italy - - -	71,343	319,839	3,525,132
Malta - - -	86,523	646,667	204,940
Turkey - - -	1,334,547	7,719,368	18,938,246
Guernsey and Jersey -	47,600	—	260
East Indies - - -	14,839,117	16,420,005	20,294,262
Otaheite and the Coast of Africa - - -	138	9,308	400
Cape of Good Hope -	—	—	10,889
British North American Colonies - - -	71,859	—	12,552
West Indies, British -	7,034,793	6,269,306	8,193,948
Foreign - - -	139,290	46,604	433,274
United States of America	142,532,112	92,187,662	139,908,699
Mexico - - -	—	141,342	2,090
Colombia - - -	130,162	284,436	487,035
Peru - - -	38,261	48,032	192,767
Chili and Buenos Ayres -	—	170,879	—
Brazil - - -	23,514,641	21,849,552	33,180,491
Other Countries - - -	177,924	37,062	846,678
Total quantity imported into the United Kingdom - - -	191,402,503	149,380,122	228,005,291
Total quantity exported from the United Kingdom - - -	9,318,403	13,299,505	18,004,953
Remains for home consumption - - -	182,184,100	136,090,617	210,000,338

INSPECTOR GENERAL'S OFFICE,  
Custom House, London,  
17th June 1826.

W. IRVING.

Notwithstanding

Perhaps we may be excused for mentioning by the way, that that party, and it is still unfortunately a very strong one, that is attached to those restrictions and prohibitions which the present Ministers have done so much to subvert, have availed themselves of the distress and ruin occasioned by the failure of the cotton and other speculations, to raise a clamour against the liberal policy of the Cabinet, and to represent the science on which that policy is founded as of no real utility, because the Economists did not warn the speculators of the ruin that awaited them! Nothing, however, can be more completely unfounded than this idea. Before an appeal can be made to *the principles* or professors of any science for assistance, care must be taken that there is no flaw in *the facts* on which the appeal is bottomed. Suppose one of our Liverpool friends had written to us, stating that he had obtained information, on which he could rely, that the crops of cotton in America, the East Indies, and Turkey were much below an average, and that the stocks on hand in this country were unusually low, we should certainly have thought that he was warranted in speculating on the advance of price that could hardly, under such circumstances, have failed to take place. But when it subsequently turned out that he was *totally wrong in his facts*, that the supply of cotton was not below an average, and that the quantity was fully commensurate with the demand; would not every one have scouted the idea of his blaming us, had he really done so, for advising him to engage in a losing adventure? The error, in such a case, would not have been ours, but his. He was a practical man whose business it was to be conversant with the real state of the markets. He had agents in America, in Egypt, and other parts of the world; and if he either directly attempted to draw inferences from false facts, or submitted these facts to others for their opinion, what could he expect but that the conclusions would be universally wrong? There was not, in point of fact, the smallest foundation

---

Notwithstanding this increased importation, the rise of price was so very great, that *bowed Georgia*, which had sold, when at the highest in 1823, at 10½d. per lib., rose in 1825, to 18½d.; and *Bengal and Surat*, which had sold when highest in 1823, at 8½d. rose in 1825, to 13½d. (Mr Tooke's *Considerations*, p. 196). Since then they have fallen, the former to about 7d., and the latter to less than 5d. per lib. The loss that the cotton speculators would have incurred, supposing they had been able to make good their engagements, has been moderately estimated at about *two and a half millions Sterling!*



for the cotton speculation: and its rise and progress are wholly to be ascribed to the ignorance and cupidity of those who engaged in it. The merchants with whom it began, supposed, as we have already seen, that the supply of cotton was deficient, when it was really redundant; and 'The impulse to a rise being once given, and every succeeding purchaser having realized, or appearing to have the power to realize a profit, a fresh inducement appeared at every step of the advance to bring forward new buyers. These were no longer such only as were conversant with the market; many persons were induced to go out of their own line, and to embark their funds or stretch their credit, with a view to engage in what was represented to them by the brokers, as a certain means of realizing a great and immediate gain.'\* Now, really it does appear to us to be rather too much for those who entered into such absurd schemes, to attempt to divert the public attention from the real causes of their ruin,—their own folly and avariciousness, by endeavouring to throw the blame on the liberal measures of ministers, and the theories of the Economists! When the data on which the speculations of a merchant are founded are correct, a knowledge of the sound principles of economical science may be of most material service in enabling him to draw a just conclusion from them. But if the data on which he proceeds are wrong, or if he is unable to apply the principles of the science, so as to ascertain the connexion and sequence of causes and effects, the error lies with him and him only; and it is the merest delusion possible to attempt to shift it from himself to the science.

The pernicious effects of mercantile miscalculation and ignorance are strikingly exhibited, in the overstocking of such new markets as are occasionally opened, and in filling them with articles totally unsuited to the wants and habits of the people. Leith and several other towns have not yet recovered from the bankruptcies that followed the overloading of the Continental markets in 1814 and 1815. But the exportations consequent upon the first opening of the trade to Brazil, Buenos Ayres, and the Carracas, were, in this respect, still more extraordinary. The practical men gave, on this occasion full scope to the spirit of speculation; and carried it to an extent which we theorists would, but for the evidence of the fact, have affirmed was quite impossible. We are informed by Mr Mawe, an intelligent traveller, who was resident in Rio Janeiro at the period in question, that more Manchester goods were sent out in the course of a few weeks than had

---

\* Mr Tooke's *Considerations on the Currency*, 2d Ed. p. 43.

been consumed in the twenty years preceding; and the quantity of English goods of all sorts with which the city was deluged, was so very great, that warehouses could not be provided sufficient to contain them, and that the most valuable merchandise was actually exposed for weeks on the beach to the weather, and to every sort of depredation! But it was chiefly in the selection of the articles sent to Brazil that these practical gentlemen made the most characteristic display of their peculiar talent. Elegant services of cut-glass and china were offered to persons whose most splendid drinking vessels consisted of a horn or the shell of a cocoa nut; tools were sent out having a hammer on the one side and a hatchet on the other, as if the inhabitants had had nothing more to do than to break the first stone they met with, and then cut the gold and diamonds from it; and some speculators, more knowing than the rest, and ready, we doubt not, to rail in good set terms against Mr Huskisson for indulging in visionary theories, filled a warehouse with *skates* for the particular use of those who had never seen ice, and who could with difficulty be brought to believe in its existence! \*

The wide-spread distress and ruin which followed these exportations, is plainly and incontestably to be ascribed to the gross and almost inconceivable ignorance of those by whom they were made. If there be one species of knowledge more essential to a merchant than another, it is that he should be acquainted with the various productions of the different commercial countries of the world, and of those which are in demand in them. And when ships are freighted, and commodities sent abroad by those who are so entirely destitute of this elementary instruction, as to send *skates* to Rio Janeiro, the wonder is not that they should sometimes calculate wrong, but that they should ever calculate right.

The dealers in corn are particularly apt to be betrayed into erroneous speculations. This arises partly from the extreme difficulty of obtaining correct information as to the state of the crops in an extensive country, and partly and principally from restrictions on importation. A few days rain immediately before, or during harvest, have frequently, by exciting apprehensions for the safety of the crops, occasioned a sudden rise of prices, which have again as suddenly fallen back to their former level when the weather improved. It is obvious, however, that if we enjoyed the inestimable advantage of a free corn trade, the fluctuations in question would be confined within a comparatively narrow range; for, in that

---

\* Mawe's Travels in Brazil, 2d Ed. pp. 453-458.

case we should be able, as well to resort to foreign markets for additional supplies when our harvest proved to be deficient, as to dispose of the excess of produce on our hands in an unusually plentiful year, by exporting it to them.

2. There is nothing, however, that tends so much to encourage miscalculation, and improvident speculation, on the part both of producers and of merchants, as sudden fluctuations in the supply and value of money. The supply of money cannot be increased without a corresponding increase taking place in prices. And if the addition made to the circulation be greater than can be permanently kept up, all who have entered into engagements in the belief that the rise of prices will continue, are necessarily involved in difficulties when they give way, in consequence of the reduction of the currency to its proper quantity. The miscalculation of particular classes of producers, or merchants, affects themselves only, or at most exerts but a comparatively slight influence over the rest of the community; but a revulsion occasioned by a sudden change in the quantity and value of money, affects every individual, and is always productive of the most pernicious results.

It has been disputed whether the late crisis in our commercial and money-system, was occasioned by mercantile miscalculation or over-trading, or by the over-issue of paper. But it does not seem difficult to discover that it was partly a consequence of both causes, though, as we conceive, principally of the latter. The cotton speculation, founded as it was on false conclusions with respect to the crops in America, might have taken place though the currency had been wholly metallic. But had such been the case, the rise of price would certainly have been confined within comparatively reasonable bounds. Those who embark most readily and eagerly in speculative adventures, are not, generally speaking, of the class of rich and old established merchants. They consist principally of those who have but recently entered into business, and who are tempted, by the chance of speedily making a fortune, to engage in such hazardous transactions. And while any unusual facility in obtaining discounts must act as an additional and powerful motive to such persons to speculate; it is at the same time obvious, that the rise of prices consequent upon the additions made to the currency, will not only lead them to believe that their anticipations are to be realized, but will induce even the most considerate to withhold their produce from market, in the expectation of a further advance.

The source of the speculating mania of 1824 and 1825, has been ascribed to a supposed *redundancy of capital*. But this

is a radical mistake. The capital of the country was not in any degree more redundant in 1825 than it is at this moment. By the act passed in 1819 for the resumption of cash payments by the Bank of England, it was fixed that the circulation of one pound notes should cease and determine on the 1st January 1826; and in consequence of the measures adopted by the bankers, in the view of preparing for this arrangement, and of the heavy fall in the price of corn occasioned by the abundant harvests of 1820, 1821, and 1822, which caused a great deal of agricultural distress, the circulation of country bank notes was very greatly diminished, and the currency became so deficient that the exchanges were all greatly in our favour. But it is evident, had the Act of 1819 not been interfered with, that this state of things would speedily have rectified itself, either by means of additional issues of Bank of England paper, or by the issue of coin. In consequence, however, of the representations made by the agriculturists of their distressed condition, arising, as they affirmed, principally from a deficient supply of money, that part of the Act of 1819, which provided for the suppression of the small note circulation, was repealed in 1822, and a new act was passed, enabling one pound notes to be circulated till the 1st of January 1833. By itself, this Act could not have had any considerable effect either one way or another; but it was combined with other measures which gave it a powerful influence. The currency being at the time depressed below its proper level, it was plainly in the power of the bankers to increase its quantity up to the level of incipient redundancy: And it was farther plain, that if they chose to reduce the interest previously charged by them upon discounts or loans, they might equally reduce the common and average rate of interest on all loans, *during the period they were issuing the additional quantity of currency.* When, indeed, they had filled the circulation up to its proper level, or to the point when their paper would begin to be returned upon them for gold, the influence of the rate at which they discounted on the common market rate of interest, must, though there had been no revulsion, have necessarily ceased; for their inability to make additional loans would have caused the rate of interest to be again determined, as it is in all ordinary cases, by the rate at which those who had real capitals were willing to lend, and those who had good security, to borrow.

The following Table shows the extraordinary fluctuations that have taken place in the number of country bank-notes afloat since 1805.

**An Account of the Number of Country Bank Notes, of all denominations, stamped in each Year, ending Oct. 10, from 1804 to 1825 inclusive, with the per Centage of increase and decrease, comparing each Year with the Year preceding, together with an estimate of the total amount of such notes in circulation, according to Mr Sedgwick's Tables, in each Year, from 1804 to 1825 inclusive, with the per Centage of increase and decrease, comparing each Year with the Year preceding. (See *Musket's Tract on Currency*, p. 215.)**

	The amount of Country Bank Notes of all denominations stamped in each Year ending Oct. 10, from 1804 to 1825.	The per Centage of increase comparing each Year with the Year preceding.	The per Centage of decrease comparing each Year with the Year preceding.	The amount of Country Bank Notes in circulation according to Mr Sedgwick's Tables, in each Year ending Oct. 10, from 1804 to 1825 inclusive.	The per Centage of increase comparing each Year with the Year preceding.	The per Centage of decrease comparing each Year with the Year preceding.
1805	11,342,413					
1806	11,480,547	1 $\frac{2}{10}$				
1807	6,587,398		42 $\frac{6}{10}$	18,021,900		
1808	8,653,077	23 $\frac{8}{10}$		16,871,524		6 $\frac{1}{10}$
1809	15,737,986 *	81 $\frac{8}{10}$		23,702,493	40 $\frac{5}{10}$	
1810	10,517,519		33 $\frac{1}{10}$	23,893,868	$\frac{8}{10}$	
1811	8,792,433		16 $\frac{4}{10}$	21,453,000	$\frac{1}{10}$	1 $\frac{6}{10}$
1812	10,577,134	20 $\frac{3}{10}$		19,944,000		7
1813	12,615,509	19 $\frac{1}{10}$		22,597,000	13 $\frac{1}{10}$	
1814	10,773,375		14 $\frac{6}{10}$	22,709,000	$\frac{5}{10}$	
1815	7,624,949		29 $\frac{2}{10}$	19,011,000		16 $\frac{1}{10}$
1816	6,423,466		15 $\frac{7}{10}$	15,096,000		20 $\frac{6}{10}$
1817	9,075,958	41 $\frac{1}{10}$		15,898,000	5 $\frac{1}{10}$	
1818	12,316,868	35 $\frac{1}{10}$		20,507,000	29	
1819	6,130,313		50 $\frac{3}{10}$	17,366,875		15 $\frac{1}{10}$
1820	3,574,894		41 $\frac{7}{10}$	11,767,391		32 $\frac{1}{10}$
1821	3,987,582	11 $\frac{5}{10}$		8,414,281		28 $\frac{1}{10}$
1822	4,217,241	5 $\frac{7}{10}$		8,067,260		4 $\frac{1}{10}$
1823	4,657,589	10 $\frac{4}{10}$		8,798,277	9	
1824	6,093,367	30 $\frac{8}{10}$		10,604,172	20 $\frac{5}{10}$	
1825	8,532,438	40		14,147,211	33 $\frac{4}{10}$	

\* In 1809 the duty on 1*l.* notes was increased from 3*d.* to 4*d.* and may account for the great increase in this year, the notes bearing a 3*d.* stamp being no longer issuable.

This then was the state of affairs in 1823 :—The country had been under-supplied with currency in 1821 and 1822; but no sooner had the Act prolonging the period for the circulation of small notes been passed in the latter, than the bankers, relieved from the necessity of providing for the withdrawal of any portion of their paper, were enabled to fill up the vacuum by increased issues; while the Bank of England, having reduced the rate of interest on discounts, from 5 to 4 per cent,\* a measure in which she was either preceded or followed by the other banks, the rate of interest was universally lowered. All the most powerful incentives to speculation were thus called at once into action. The unusually depressed state of prices in 1822 and 1823 would have justified a considerate person in anticipating a considerable advance in most articles; and this, joined to the peculiar and unprecedented facilities afforded by the new state of the money-market, induced a very large proportion of our merchants and manufacturers to enter on the most gigantic speculations, and led ultimately to such a display of folly and infatuation, and so complete an abandonment of all sober, practical, views of trade, as we have the authority of Mr Tooke for saying, has never been exhibited except perhaps during the famous South-Sea delusion in 1720.

The reduction in the rate of interest had a double effect. It tempted those, who had previously been in the habit of getting accommodations from the banks, to borrow larger sums; and it tempted individuals possessed of monied property, and not engaged in business, to embark in projects which they were taught to believe would yield them a greater return for their capital. In addition to these stimuli, the *long* dates at which bills were now freely discounted by almost all the Scotch and by many of the English banks, added new force to the spirit of speculation. Those who procured discounts at four, six, nine, and, as was sometimes the case, even at twelve and eighteen months, were consequently enabled to withhold their produce from market, in order to speculate upon a farther advance, and were also led to adventure in time-bargains, or to buy goods at an advanced price that were not to be delivered for some considerable period. The quantity of produce brought to market was thus, on the one hand, artificially diminished, while, on the other, the rise of prices caused by this diminution and the increase of money, and the eagerness of the speculators

---

\* Government is understood to have approved and recommended this reduction—a circumstance which Lord Liverpool would do well to recal to his recollection the next time he puts in his favourite claim to a prescience of the late revulsion.

to enter into time-bargains, or contracts for goods to be delivered at a distant term, gave an extraordinary encouragement to the production and importation of the articles that were the principal objects of speculative demand. The rise of prices that took place in 1824, and the first half of 1825, was thus rendered vastly greater than any that could have been occasioned by the mere additions, great as they were, that were then made to the currency. A large proportion of the transactions that were entered into during the period in question, were effected by means of bills on private individuals; and comparatively few of the time-bargains, or of the transactions that had been partially effected by means of bills at long dates discounted by the bankers, had been completed when the recoil took place. The moment the test of real payments began to be applied, the unsubstantial fabric fell straightway to the ground; involving the speculators, and those who had been engaged in the production and importation of commodities on their account, in one common ruin.

Undoubtedly, however, nothing contributed so much to bring on the late crisis, and to render it so fatally destructive, as the power that has been so absurdly given to every individual, however ignorant, poor, or unprincipled, who chooses to dub himself a Banker, to issue paper money. Those qualities in a banker which excite the public confidence, and which consequently obtain a greater or less degree of circulation for his notes, are of the most deceitful and treacherous description; and numberless instances have occurred in the history of British banking within the last few years, in which the notes of individuals without any real capital, and who were from the beginning in a state of insolvency, have continued to circulate for a long period in company with the notes of the best established houses, and to enjoy an equal degree of credit. It is obvious, too, inasmuch as the profits made by a banking company, by the issue of notes, must depend on the excess of the paper they have afloat over the dead stock they are obliged to keep in their coffers to meet the demands of the public, that such country banks as have little capital, must, generally speaking, be extremely anxious to get their paper into circulation. Rich and old established houses have their choice of business; and can afford to be cautious as to the bills they discount. But those who depend for support on the profits to be derived from the number of their notes abroad, and who have little or nothing of their own to lose, are necessarily less scrupulous. It is to them, therefore, that speculators, engaged in hazardous adventures, uni-

formly resort; and during periods when confidence is high, and prices on the advance, the most worthless paper is sure to be negotiated. Many of the English country bankers, who failed during the late crisis, were not only in the habit of discounting the paper of those engaged in the wildest projects, but of paying a high commission to persons employed to circulate their notes! In fact, their only object seemed to be, to get themselves indebted to the public. Nor, when establishments, conducted on such principles, and enjoying an unlimited degree of credit, were to be met with in every district of the empire, and when individuals, who never were masters of any real capital of their own, frequently succeeded in obtaining, by their means, the command of immense sums, can we be surprised that every sort of wild and profligate adventure should have abounded,—‘that incipient delusion should have been converted into absolute insanity,’\* or that the most dreadful recoil should have been experienced, when a shock was given to the system?

Had the country bankers been compelled, as every banking company, whether it consists of ten or ten thousand partners, ought to be, to give *full security* for the payment of their notes, such a state of things, as we have just described, could not possibly have taken place. Banking companies possessed, as those who give security for their issues must necessarily be, of ample capitals, would have exercised a proper degree of caution in the discount of paper; and although it is possible that the currency might, even under such a system, have become redundant, *the redundancy would have been limited to the degree in which the exchange was depressed*, and each and all of the banks would have had the means, without laying themselves under the least difficulty, of withdrawing such a portion of their paper from circulation, as would have restored the currency to its proper level, and the exchange to par. But under our present system—a system which, to use the just and forcible expressions of Lord Liverpool, ‘*allows a cobbler or cheesemonger to usurp the Royal prerogative, and to issue Money without check or control*,’† the paper of a large proportion of the country banks cannot be withdrawn. And when the exchange becomes unfavourable, and the Bank of England is in consequence obliged to narrow her issues, all confidence immediately ceases; and the run which then takes place upon the country banks is not limited to the withdrawal of such a por-

---

\* Tooke’s Considerations on the Currency, 2d Ed. p. 48.

† Lord Liverpool’s Speech, 17th February 1826.



tion of their paper as might be required to bring the country currency to the same level as that of London,—which would most certainly be its full extent if the banks gave security for their issues—but is converted into a *panic*, by the suspicion of insolvency, that must necessarily attach, more or less, to almost every banking company organized under the present system.

It should be observed, that a very slight fall in the exchange is at present sufficient to cause an exportation of gold coin. Previously to 1819, the exportation of coin, or of bullion formed out of coin, was forbidden under the severest penalties; and though there is abundant evidence to show, that this prohibition was altogether ineffectual to retain the coin at home when the exchange afforded a sufficient profit on its exportation, still it is quite clear, that the trouble, expense, and extra-risk incurred in consequence of this prohibition must have had the effect to render a considerably greater depression of the exchange necessary to occasion such an exportation, than will now suffice for that purpose. We have been assured by some of the best informed bullion merchants, that a difference of *one-eighth* per cent. in the price of gold in Great Britain and the Continent, is quite enough to occasion its instant exportation: And as our coin is at present in a state of very great perfection, and Government has chosen to burden itself with the expenses of coinage—a regulation just about as wise, as if it were to manufacture tea-pots and vases, or hats and pantaloons gratis, to all who have a demand for such articles—it has become a desirable article of traffic, and its exportation takes place in very large quantities, under circumstances when no part of it could formerly have left the country.

It is, therefore, quite evident that if the late contraction of the currency had been confined to the removal of such a portion of the superfluous paper of the metropolis and the provinces, as might have been required to restore the exchange to *par*, and consequently to dry up the drain for gold on the Bank of England, it could not possibly have reached to a *tenth part* of the magnitude to which it actually attained. But when a shock had been given by the reduction of the issues of the Bank of England to the paper system, and suspicion had been in consequence awakened from her trance, there were no longer any limits to the run. Paper was not carried to the banks to obtain gold, in the view of exporting it as a mercantile adventure to the Continent, but for the purpose of escaping that bankruptcy and ruin, in which it immediately became evident that a very large proportion of the hold-

ers of country notes would be involved. The best established houses did not escape imputations. *Sauve qui peut*, was the universal cry. And the reduction of country paper was so sudden and excessive, that, in less than six weeks, a vacuum was created, which has absorbed from *eight to ten millions* of additional issues by the Bank of England; at the same time that myriads of those private bills that previously served to swell the amount of the currency, and to add to the machinery of speculation have been swept off.

It is, we take leave to say, the merest drivelling possible to suppose that the measures proposed during the late Session, for the amendment of the currency, afford any real or substantial remedy for the abuses inherent in the system on which it is now issued. It is true, that Lord Liverpool has proscribed the 1*l.* notes of his friends the cobblers and cheesemongers of England, though he has apparently forgot that the 5*l.*, 10*l.*, and 20*l.* notes, which these worthies are still allowed to issue, *without check or control of any sort*, are about as difficult to withdraw from circulation as those of 1*l.*; and that, in point of fact, a *FULL THIRD of all the country banks of England stopped payment in 1793, though no 1*l.* notes, or notes for less than 5*l.*, were then in circulation!* It would be a libel on the good sense of Parliament and the country, to suppose that they should continue to tolerate a system productive of so much misery. Its unavoidable effect is to render every industrious undertaking as much of a gambling transaction, as if its success depended on a throw of the dice. We believe, indeed, that the late measures were well intended; but it is not too much to say, that they were proposed without due consideration, and are altogether ineffectual to the grand object that ought to be kept constantly in view,—*that of establishing the currency on a solid foundation, with the least expense and inconvenience to the country, and to all parties concerned.* To effect this object, it is essential that no paper of any description whatever should be allowed to be issued, except by those who are both able and willing to give full security for its payment: And, as the same means which are necessary to establish five and ten pound notes on a secure basis, may be equally applied to one pound notes, the currency of the latter may be continued without loss to any individual; which will save the country the heavy, and, under the circumstances of the case, we scruple not to say, wanton and unnecessary expense, attending the supplying of their place with gold.

Though it is certainly true that the late revulsion was wholly unexpected by the vast majority of the public, it cannot be said that there were no previous signs or indications of its approach, or

that it did not 'cast its shadow before.' Early in spring 1824, an efflux of the metals to South America was taking place; and in June and July 1824, there was a decided fall in the Continental exchanges, and the exportation of gold coin and bullion began to be carried on to a great extent. Here, therefore, as Mr. Tooke has justly stated, was a warning not to be mistaken, that the currency had become redundant: And it must ever be regretted, that the Directors of the Bank of England did not then set about contracting their issues. Had they done this, all the subsequent overissue of the country banks, and the absurd speculations that took place in the early part of last year, would have been effectually prevented, while the crisis that would then have taken place would have been comparatively gentle. But instead of being reduced, the issues of the Bank of England were actually increased in 1824 and during the first three months of 1825, and in consequence, the issues of the country banks were increased in a still greater proportion. But it is obvious, that every person acquainted with the state of the exchanges, or who knew that a heavy drain for bullion was operating on the Bank, which nothing but the magnitude of the treasure she had previously accumulated could have enabled her to withstand for any considerable period, must, had he been possessed even of the merest elements of the science of money, have been aware that the whole paper system had become hollow and unsound, and that its explosion could not be long averted. Nor is it true, as has been said, that these are conclusions that have been come to after the event, and when every one was in a condition to make them. It was impossible, indeed, to foretel the exact period when the revulsion was to take place, or its extent. But speculations with respect to the effect that the drain for gold would ultimately have on the banks, were freely indulged in for several months before the Directors began to contract their issues. We have repeatedly heard merchants and bankers of the greatest experience, express their decided opinion, in March and April 1825, that we were on the eve of a tremendous revulsion. And in various tracts published several months previously, it was shown that the circulation had become over full; and that, when the Bank of England did contract her issues, as it was certain she would in the end be obliged to do, the contraction would affect the country banks in a way which would most probably be destructive of many of these establishments. Nothing, therefore, can be more incorrect, than to contend, that the late revulsion was not foreseen, or that there were no previous presages of the coming tempest. It is true, indeed, that no attention was paid to those

who endeavoured to call the public attention to these signs, or to apprise them of their real situation. It was to no purpose to tell those infected with the fever of speculation, that a large proportion of the currency rested on no good foundation, that it had become redundant, and that there would inevitably be a recoil. Such representations were almost universally scouted, as the idle suggestions of visionary theorists; while the few who admitted that they *might* be true, flattered themselves with the expectation—in which, by the way, they have been almost universally disappointed—that the system would last long enough to enable them to realize a fortune, and that they would be able to withdraw from the field before the bursting of the bubble.

We have thus shortly endeavoured to investigate the causes of those improvident speculations, into which producers and merchants are always so exceedingly prone to enter; and the effects which an increased facility of obtaining money, and an augmentation of the currency, have on such speculations. We hope we have sufficiently indicated the various means by which the temptation to engage in these improvident enterprises may be most effectually diminished, and their pernicious consequences mitigated or averted: The *first* consists in the establishment of such a system of free intercourse with other countries, as would give greater steadiness both to the demand for, and the supply of commodities; the *second*, in placing of the currency on such a secure and solid foundation, as would prevent such violent oscillations in its amount and value, as have been experienced since 1793; and, the *third*, in the more general diffusion of sound information among all classes of the community, but especially among merchants. The details into which we have entered, show how very ill the true principles of commerce and of money are yet understood by the public. Had our merchants and bankers been generally aware of the circumstances which determine the value of money, and of the tests by which it may always be discovered when it is becoming redundant, and when, therefore, a recoil may be expected, it is quite impossible that the late crisis could have occurred. The danger would have been foreseen while it was time to avert it; and bankruptcy and ruin would not have assailed us at the very moment we were boasting most loudly of our prosperity.

---

ART. IV.—*A History of England, from the first Invasion of the Romans.* By JOHN LINGARD, D. D. Vol. VII. and VIII. 8vo. London, 1823.

**I**N resuming our examination of Dr Lingard's History of England, we shall pursue the plan we adopted in our former article. We have already expressed our opinion of his work as a literary composition, and we see no reason to add to our praise, or to soften our disapprobation. We had begun to examine his pretensions to superior diligence and fidelity as an historian; and we now resume the task, without shrinking from the consequences, or being deterred by the labour of the investigation.

We selected for our former Review the Anglo-Saxon portion of his history; not in the vain expectation that we could interest our readers in the dry and uninviting discussions of Saxon controversy, but out of fairness to Dr Lingard, who had bestowed uncommon pains on that part of our national annals, having written a separate work on the subject. The result of our scrutiny was unfavourable to his reputation as a candid and faithful historian.

Finding that, even in the history of so remote an age, zeal for his order had made him forgetful of his duty as an historian, we had little doubt, that, if we selected for examination a more trying period, where the credit and interests of his church were more directly concerned, we should see displayed in a stronger light the passions and prejudices of the author: And, adhering to our former rule, of not intermeddling with the disputes between the Roman and the Anglican church, we made choice of his account of the Massacre of St Bartholomew as the next subject for our critical dissection. If this was an event calculated to excite or embitter his religious animosities, it was for that very reason the business of a cautious historian to be on his guard against them. If it was a transaction, respecting which the English public were comparatively but slightly informed, it became more imperatively his duty, not to take advantage of their ignorance, to mislead and deceive them. We do not deny, that, from the specimen we had already had of Dr Lingard's talents for ecclesiastical controversy, we were prepared for many errors and misrepresentations in this part of his work. And certainly we have not been mistaken in our anticipations. The harvest has been infinitely more abundant than we had expected, and our opinion of Dr Lingard, as an historian, has in the same proportion declined.

In the dissertation he has introduced on the St Bartholomew, Dr Lingard assures his readers, that, if he has given a different explanation of that bloody transaction from the hypothesis usually adopted by historians, his 'opinion was not formed till after a diligent perusal and comparison of the most 'authentic documents on the subject.' \*

We have a better opinion, we must confess, of Dr Lingard's talents, than to give entire credit to this assertion. Of the authors he has referred to on the St Bartholomew, we are persuaded there are some, of whose works he has not seen even the title-page, and that, of others, he has been content with a slight and transient glance. We have found in his account of that transaction no marks of diligence or research, and many plain indications of carelessness and haste, of borrowed learning and inexcusable indifference to historical accuracy. If he had read with attention, or read at all, the works to which he appeals, he could not have misconceived or misrepresented them as he has done. If he had taken the pains to examine the authorities he cites, he could not have referred his readers to passages that prove the reverse of what they are brought to establish. If he had even perused with ordinary care such authors as he appears to have consulted, he could not have hazarded the assertions he has made, or, in his desire to give dramatic effect to a particular scene in his narrative, have ventured on the colouring he has there employed.

The view Dr Lingard has given of the St Bartholomew is taken from the Abbé de Caveyrac, a controversial writer of the last century, who annexed to an apology for the Revocation of the Edict of Nantz, published in 1758, a dissertation on that massacre. Dr Lingard has selected with judgment from Caveyrac the strongest points of his case, and has condescended on several occasions even to translate his words. We suspect, indeed, that all the knowledge he possesses of the St Bartholomew is derived from that author; and that it is only through the medium of Caveyrac that he has seen and 'diligently compared' the original documents on the subject. But, though he has occasionally referred to Caveyrac's dissertation for authorities that were probably not within his reach, he has nowhere acknowledged the extent of his obligations to the Abbé, or informed his readers of the source from which the account he has given of the massacre is derived. The work of Caveyrac had little success when it first appeared, and obtained no favourable reputation for its author. The doctrines

---

\* Lingard, viii. 515.

he maintained were repugnant to the spirit of the age in which he lived, and, with the intolerance he professed, his book sunk rapidly into oblivion. Resuscitated by the zeal of Dr Lingard, he really ought to have had more ample credit for his labours, from one who had embraced his theory, and adopted, without adding to, his researches.

In discussing the number of persons that perished in the St Bartholomew, we have the following passage in Caveyrac.—‘Perefixe a écrit qu’il périt cent mille personnes; Sully, soixante et dix mille; De Thou, trente mille, ou même *un peu moins*; La Popelinière, plus de vingt mille; le Martyrologe des Calvinistes, quinze mille; Papire Masson, près de dix mille,’\*—which we have thus translated by Dr Lingard. ‘Among the Hugonot writers, Perefix reckons 100,000, Sully 70,000, Thuanus 30,000, La Popeliniere 20,000, the Reformed Martyrologist 15,000, and Masson 10,000.’† Our readers will observe, that the only alteration made by Dr Lingard, in his version of this passage, is the epithet of *Hugonot* bestowed on the authors. But, if he had read, or even looked into their works, is it conceivable he could have fallen into such a blunder? Perefixe was preceptor of Louis XIV, Bishop of Rhodéz, and afterwards Archbishop of Paris. It is needless to add, he was no Hugonot, and difficult to explain how Dr Lingard could have mistaken him for one. De Thou, indeed, has been accused by Caveyrac of a secret bias to Calvinism. There is an expression, it seems, in that great and impartial historian, which, to the piercing eye of the Abbé, ‘jette un furieux soupçon sur sa Catholici-té;’‡ and Dr Lingard, better versed in the works of Caveyrac than in those of De Thou, (whom he has not once quoted in his History), has been probably misled by this passage. He may be assured, however, that De Thou was ostensibly at least a Catholic, and has been usually accounted such. But though Caveyrac may be made responsible for Dr Lingard’s mistake about De Thou, what excuse can be offered for his classing Papire Masson among the Hugonots? How greatly would that worthy personage have been surprised to find himself in such company! Papire Masson was not only a Catholic, but for part of his life he wore the habit of a Jesuit; and though he became afterwards a lawyer, he continued so furious and blind a zealot, that, unconscious of the impression it had made on the rest of mankind, he considered the St Bartholomew a fit subject for pleasantry, and had no other fault to find with the massacre, but the extraordinary one, that blood enough

---

\* Caveyrac, xxxvi. † Lingard, viii. 520. ‡ Caveyrac, liv.

was not shed in the course of it ! ‘ Si in Aquitania, ’ he exclaims with a sigh, ‘ ubi hoc malum latius scerpserat *Parisiensium medicorum remedia* tunc adhiberi potuissent, idem annus finem ‘ bellorum civilium et initium diuturnæ pacis attulisset ; sed alter cœlitibus visum est ! ’ \* By what process so determined an enemy of heresy has been converted into a Hugonot by Dr Lingard, we shall not attempt to explain. One thing, however, appears to us certain, that the mistake could not have happened, if the work of Papire Masson, short as it is, had not escaped Dr Lingard’s ‘ diligent perusal of the original documents ’ on this subject. We may venture to call Papire Masson’s *Life of Charles IX.* an original document, as it was written in 1575, within three years of the massacre.

Dr Lingard tells us, that the particulars he relates of the St Bartholomew are ‘ taken from the narrative of the Duke of Anjou, with a few additional circumstances from the *Memoirs of Queen Margaret*, and those of Tavannes. All three were ‘ in the Louvre at the time, and two of them were among the ‘ devisers of this massacre. ’ † His readers will naturally conclude from this observation, that the *Memoirs of Tavannes* were written by Marshal Tavannes, who was indeed not only one of the devisers of the massacre, but one of the most active instruments in carrying it into execution. But, if Dr Lingard had read the book called *Memoirs of Tavannes*, he must have known that it was composed, not by the Marshal himself, but by his third son, John Vicount de Tavannes ; who was too young, at the time of the St Bartholomew, to be admitted into the private councils where the massacre was devised, and had too austere a father to venture on questioning him, or attempting to penetrate into his secrets. Caveyrac, indeed, who was not unacquainted with this fact, is confident that the son ‘ n’a écrit, sans doute, ses *Memoires* que sur ce qu’il lui avoit oui-dire. ’ ‡ But, unfortunately for this ‘ sans doute, ’ we have the testimony of the son himself to the contrary. ‘ J’ai vu, j’ai sçu partie de faits, de *Monsieurs de Tavannes*, mon pere, ’ says the son, ‘ non de tout par lui, qui, à la forme des anciens Français, s’emploioit à faire, non à dire, si peu curieux de vanité, qu’il a refusé des *Memoires* à ceux qui vouloient (disoient-ils) immortaliser son nom. ’ § The father survived the massacre only eleven months ; and the son, who was only eighteen years of age at his father’s death, passed a great part of that interval near Rochelle, at a distance from him, and did not finish the miscellaneous composition called

\* *Vita Caroli IX.*, apud Castelnau, iii. 16.

† Lingard, viii. 519. ‡ Caveyrac, xv.

§ Tavannes, *Epître à ses Parens*.

VOL. XLIV. NO. 87.



**Memoirs of Tavannes till fifty years afterwards.\*** It appears to have been the work of his old age, and contains many curious and interesting anecdotes, which he must have collected from hearsay and family tradition. It is in general full of prejudice, but has some passages remarkable for their candour. Being written when the causes of the St Bartholomew had become matter of historical discussion, it must be regarded as a controversial work; and can at no rate be received as the authority of one who was 'among the devisers of the massacre.'

The supposition that the massacre of St Bartholomew was planned a considerable time before it was carried into execution, is 'unsupported,' Dr Lingard tells us, 'by contemporary authority.'† This, we must confess, does strike us as a most extraordinary allegation, from one who has diligently perused all the original documents on the subject. If it does not proceed, as we suspect it does, from the author having confined his researches to what was to be found in Caveyrac's dissertation, there is a degree of hardihood in the assertion that challenges admiration—with whatever other feelings it may be blended. Within less than a month after the massacre, Camillo Capilupi, nephew of the cardinal of that name, drew up at Rome an account of the St Bartholomew, in the form of a letter to his brother Alfonso, which was seen and approved of by the Cardinal of Lorraine, and begun to be printed under his inspection. In this little work a circumstantial account is given of the bloody tragedy recently enacted at Paris, in which the contrivance, preparation, and execution of the massacre, are related, with overflowing joy, triumph, and exultation. The author boasts that *it had been planned two years before*, when the last peace was made with the Hugonots, and had been conducted to its termination by the King and the Queen-mother, with incredible address and dissimulation.‡ The Bishop of Valence, in his address to the Poles in exculpation of the St Bartholomew, published within a few months of the massacre, admits that the Protestants charged the King with having long dissembled his design before he was able to carry it into effect.§ Papire Masson, who wrote his Life of

\* Tavannes, 395, 457, 461.

† Lingard, viii. 519.

‡ *Lo Stratagema*, 4to. 1572, reprinted with a French translation, 12mo. 1574. In the first edition, the dedication to Alfonso Capilupi is dated Rome, September 18th, 1572.

§ *Mem. de l'Etat sous Cha. 9.* ii. 45.

Charles IX. in 1575, introduces his account of what he calls the ‘Clades Parisiensis,’ in the following words: ‘Cum vero desperatus morbus anxiam et periculosam curationem requirere videretur, nec aliter sanari posse quam *astu* et *sævitia*, *astum præmisit, per speciem nuptiarum* Margaritæ sororis et Henrici Borbonii principis Bigarrorum.’\* Adriani, a contemporary Italian historian of eminence, traces back the first design of the St Bartholomew to the interview at Bayonne in 1565.† So much for Catholic authorities. With respect to Protestants, we shall cite but two contemporary vouchers for the accusation, among the many hundreds that present themselves. Schomberg, ambassador of Charles IX. with the Protestant princes of Germany, writes to his master on the 9th of October 1572, that the Elector of Saxony is convinced by the intelligence he has received from different quarters, ‘que ce qui a été fait à l’endroit du feu l’Admiral et ses adherens, a été par préméditation, et pour la totale ruine et extermination de ceux de leur religion, et de la religion même.’‡ In December 1572, the Hugonots of Dauphiné having assembled, at the request of the Count de Gordes, to consider whether they should lay down their arms, decided in the negative, after a discussion in which one of their number described, in the following words, the massacre of St Bartholomew: ‘Le vingt-quatrième d’Aout, par le malheureux conseil des perfides, *projeté de plus long main*, sous l’appât de banquets et nûces, les principaux d’entre eux furent meurtris dans le palais royal, et dans la capitale ville du royaume.’§ The suspicions of the Hugonots and the conviction of the Catholics, may be unfounded; but, with such evidence before him, how could Dr Lingard, who has diligently perused and compared the most authentic documents on the subject, insinuate to his readers, that the charge of premeditation against the authors of the massacre was the invention of later times, by saying that it was unsupported by contemporary authority? The charge may be unfounded, but its existence is coeval with the massacre.

But, if Dr Lingard has been remiss in his search after original authorities, and if he has cited books which he appears never to have seen, he has been no less negligent in his examination of the works that have passed through his hands. His

---

\* Castelnau, iii. 16.

† Adriani, Storia, ii. Lib. xviii. 1320. Lib. xxii. pp. 44. 49. Edition of 1583.

‡ MSS. Bibliotheque du Roi, 996. St Germain.

§ Mem. de l’Etat sous Cha. 9. ii. 36.

chief authority for the version he has adopted of the St Bartholomew, is the account of it given by the Duke of Anjou, afterwards Henry III. of France, when in Poland, to a person of consideration in his service. This curious narrative was first published in the Supplement to the Memoirs of Villeroy, Secretary of State under Henry III. and Henry IV., as a discourse addressed by Henry III. when in Poland, to a person of honour and rank in attendance on his person at Cracow; and it has been lately reprinted with the same title by M. Petitot. In Matthieu's History of France, where it next appeared, we are told it was addressed to Miron, the King's physician; and, in Le Long's *Bibliothèque Historique de la France*, it is said to have been directed to M. de Souvré. But, whoever was the person to whom it was addressed, the occasion that led to it was the following. In his journey through Germany to Poland, where he had been elected king, Henry was repeatedly insulted and mortified with allusions to the St Bartholomew. As he went in procession through the towns, amidst the acclamations directed by the public authorities, execrations from men, women, and children, met his ears; at palaces where he lodged, pictures exhibiting the horrid scenes of the massacre were obtruded on his sight, with the victims and assassins represented to the life; and at banquets, and on other festive occasions, allusions were made to his guilt, and to that of his companions in the journey, which alarmed their fears, and provoked their indignation. Two days after his arrival at Cracow, unable to sleep from the recollection of these insults, and agitated with the remembrance of the bloody scenes which they had recalled to his memory, he sent for one of the persons in attendance, and bid him write down what he was going to dictate on the St Bartholomew. Our present business is not to discuss the degree of credit due to this narrative, but to examine the use Dr Lingard has made of it.

According to this story, the massacre of St Bartholomew arose out of an unsuccessful attempt to assassinate the Admiral Coligny, undertaken by direction of the Queen-mother, and of her son the Duke of Anjou, without the concurrence or knowledge of the King; on the failure of which, the Queen and her Catholic counsellors, partly by insinuation, and partly by fear, obtained an order from the King to put to death the Admiral and his principal adherents. By this tale the odium of a preconcerted plot, concealed for many months, and disguised with infinite art and dissimulation, is avoided; and the guilt of the original authors of the St Bartholomew is reduced to the intended commission of a single murder, which by accident was

extended to a greater number, and, by the fury of an exasperated and fanatical populace, was converted into a general massacre of all the Hugonots in Paris.

If we are to believe this account, the determination to put to death the Admiral and other chiefs of the Hugonots, was not adopted till the day before the massacre; and the interval between the decision and the commencement of the slaughter being necessarily spent in preparations, no time was left for the Counsellors to reflect, or to reconsider what they were about. Dr Lingard has improved on this hint, and postponed the final resolution till 'ten in the evening,' before the massacre was to begin. 'Four hours,' he tells us, having 'elapsed before the plan was arranged, and the necessary orders had been given, it wanted two more to the appointed time. To sleep in such circumstances was impossible; and the King, his Mother and Brothers, repaired to an open balcony, where they stood gazing at the stars, and waiting the result.'\* Of this picturesque description we find few traces in the original. We are there told, that after the King's dinner (which was in those days at eleven), the Queen-mother, her son the Duke of Anjou, and her other confidants, went into his closet, and stated to him the reasons that, in their opinion, made it necessary to despatch the Admiral without delay. The discourses held on the occasion are given at length. The King is represented as at first unwilling to give up the Admiral, but as at length transported with sudden rage, exclaiming in fury and passion, 'Puisque nous trouvions bon qu'on tuât l'Admiral, qu'il le vouloit,—mais aussi tous les Huguenots de France, à fin qu'il n'en demeurât pas un qui lui peut reprocher après, et que nous y donnassions ordre promptement. Et sortant furieusement, nous laissa dans son cabinet, où nous avisâmes *le reste du jour, le soir et une bonne partie de la nuit*, ce qui sembla à propos pour l'exécution d'une telle entreprise. Nous nous assurâmes du prévôt des marchands, des capitaines des quartiers et autres personnes que nous pensions les plus factieux, faisant un departement des quartiers de la ville, desseinans les uns pour executer particulièrement sur aucuns, comme fût M. de Guise pour tuer l'Admiral. Or, *après avoir reposé seulement deux heures la nuit*, ainsi que le jour commençoit à poindre, le Roi, la Reine-ma mere et moi allâmes au portail du Louvre, joinant le jeu de paume, en une chambre que regarde sur la place de la basse-court, pour voir le commencement de l'exécution.'† It appears, therefore, 1. That the

\* Lingard, viii. 518. † Petitot. Collect. des Memoires, xliv. 508.

resolution to execute the massacre was not postponed till ten in the evening, but adopted many hours before; 2. That the time employed in preparations was not four hours only, but the rest of the day, the evening, and a good part of the night; 3. That instead of passing two hours at an open balcony, gazing at the stars, the Queen and her sons had two hours sleep before break of day, when they went to the balcony to enjoy the commencement of the massacre. Dr Lingard is pleased to make the party, that repaired to the balcony, consist of the King, his mother and *brothers*. His brothers were the Dukes of Anjou and Alençon. The narrative of the former mentions no brother of the King present but himself; and, with respect to the Duke of Alençon, we have his own authority for saying, that, ignorant of what was going on, he passed a sleepless night during the massacre, terrified at the stir and tumult he heard in the streets, but not knowing what it was all about.\*

If Dr Lingard should appeal to the *Memoirs of Queen Margaret* in justification of the hour he has fixed for the final resolution to perpetrate the massacre, we reply, why take the hour from Margaret, and reject the other parts of her story? Why, following in other particulars the narrative of her brother, engraft on it a date inconsistent with the other circumstances he relates? Of the two accounts, there can be no doubt which is the best entitled to credit. Margaret was no party to the plot; and to the last moment before its execution, she remained in ignorance of what was in contemplation. What she learned subsequently of the preparations for the massacre, was from the report of others; and what she relates of it in her *Memoirs*, was written many years after it happened. The Duke of Anjou, on the contrary, dictated his discourse within two years of the event, while the occurrences were still fresh in his memory. He was one of the contrivers of the bloody tragedy, and privy to all the consultations that led to it. How far his evidence is to be trusted, in extenuation of his own guilt, and that of his accomplices, may indeed be a matter of doubt; but there can be no question that his account is to be preferred to that of his sister, who is only a hearsay witness, and had her information from persons equally implicated with him in the guilt of the transaction.

The narrative of Henry, according to Dr Lingard, 'is the work, not of one who seeks to excuse, but who fairly accuses himself.' That he frankly, and without disguise, acknow-

---

\* Castelnau, ii. 357.

ledges his own and his mother's guilt, in hiring an assassin to murder the Admiral, on a bare suspicion that he had prejudiced the King against them, is most true; that he owns, what could not be denied, that he had a principal share in advising and planning the massacre, is most certain: But that he expresses contrition for his crime, or seems at all conscious of the enormity of his wickedness, is no where to be seen in his narrative. After relating his unsuccessful attempt on the Admiral's life, he proceeds to say, '*Ce beau coup failli, et de si près, nous fit penser à nos affaires—ma mere et moi.*'\* Caveyrac, aware that this expression might appear inconsistent with the remorse which it was his object to attribute to the Duke of Anjou in this communication, has taken advantage of some MSS. where the word *beau* is left out, to omit that epithet in his abridgment of the narrative; and that omission has probably misled Dr Lingard. De Thou, who had better means than either of judging the character of Henry, says, that he not only made no secret of his participation in the St Bartholomew, but reckoned it among the glorious acts of his life—'*Nam is se ejus auctorem perhibebat, idque in gloriæ ponebat.*'†

According to the hypothesis of Caveyrac and Dr Lingard, the planners of the massacre intended only the death of Coligny and other chiefs, the indiscriminate slaughter of the Hugonots that followed being the work of an unlicensed mob. In support of this opinion, Dr Lingard mentions a proclamation of the King on the evening of the massacre, ordering 'every man to return to his house, and to abstain from deeds of violence, under the penalty of death;' and quotes from La Popelinière the following passage—'*à diverses fois le roy itera vers le soir les premières defences à tout homme sous peine de la vie, &c.*'‡ The fate of this quotation has been singular. La Popelinière tells us, that remonstrances having been made to the King on the danger of giving too much license to the rabble, he, '*vers le soir de Dimanche, fit faire defences à son de trompe qu'autres que ceux de la garde et les officiers de la ville, ne prissent les armes ni prisonniers, sur la vie. Ains, que tous à l'avenir fussent mis ez mains de la justice, et qu'ils se retirassent en leurs maisons clauses.*' This proclamation, La Popelinière adds, was not without effect, and gave some persons an opportunity to escape from Paris; but for those who staid in the town, there was still danger—'*aux poursuivis*

---

\* Petiot. 502.

† Thuan. iii. 316, folio 1733.

‡ Lingard vi, ii. 519, and note referring to La Popelinière, ii. 67

‘le peuple ne paroissoit rien quicter de sa fureur; encor qu’à diverses fois le roy iterast ces premieres deffenses à tout homme, sous peine de la vie, de prendre armes ny prisonniers *sans son congé*. Si bien que le presque dernier jour de la semaine fut peu moins remarqué de meurtres particuliers qu’avoient été les autres.’ \* Caveyrac, in quoting the first part of this passage, has omitted the words we have printed in italics, (*quatre*); † and by this fraud on his readers, has converted into an absolute prohibition of further cruelty, what was merely intended to restrain the disorderly excesses of the rabble, and to give regularity to the future pursuit against the Hugonots. Dr Lingard, improving on his master, has crowded into a single evening the proclamations of many days; and both have concealed the important fact, that notwithstanding these proclamations, the massacre went on, with little abatement, to the end of the week. The words cited by Dr Lingard from La Popelinière are not to be found in that author as they stand in Dr Lingard’s quotation. The words ‘vers le soir’ are from one passage, and the rest of the sentence from another. Nor is the ‘&c.’ in Dr Lingard’s citation unworthy of notice. We may judge of what is hid under it, from the proclamation of the 26th of August, two days after the commencement of the massacre, which enjoins, on pain of death, ‘qu’aucun ne fut si hardi de tuer ame vivante, de piller ou tourmenter aucun, *‘fors ceux qui seront ordonnés pour ce faire.’*’

The truth is, it was not intended by these proclamations, imperfectly executed as they were, to protect the Hugonots from further harm, but to restrain the rabble from indiscriminate pillage and massacre. While orders were issued to prevent plunder and unlicensed slaughter, the gates of the town were kept shut, and carefully watched by the King’s command, that not a Hugonot might get out ‘ni par compere, ni par commere,’ as was said; and directions were given to those in authority to search in every street and in every house for Hugonots, and to commit the men to prison, leaving the women and children in the custody of their Catholic relations; and of those shut up in prison, many were privately murdered in the night, and their bodies thrown into the river. ‡ Mezeray tells us, that after the King’s proclamations forbidding all persons but his guards and the officers of the town to go about armed, or arrest prisoners, ‘les meurtres et les saccage-

\* La Popelinière, ii. 67.

† Caveyrac, xxv.

‡ MS. Bibliothèque du Roi, vol. 252. Colbert—Mem. de l’État sous Cha. 9. l. 216. 226.

‘ mens se firent avec plus d’ordre, mais non avec moins du ‘cruauté.’\*’

The exclamation attributed to Charles by his brother, that since his Council thought it right to kill the Admiral, he was content to have it so, but all the Hugonots of France must perish too, that none might be left to reproach him with the deed—the minute and deliberate orders given by his counsellors to the provost, to the captains of the districts, and to the persons thought to be the most factious in Paris—the arrangements made, though accidentally defeated, for surprising and slaughtering the Hugonots quietly lodged in the Fauxbourg St Germain—the military parade of Montpensier, Tavannes and Nevers through the streets—their assurances to the populace that it was the intention of the King to extirpate all the Hugonots—the cry of ‘ Kill ! kill ! bleeding is as wholesome in August as in May ’ †—are inconsistent with the hypothesis of Caveyrac and Lingard, that it was the intention of the planners of the massacre to kill only the Admiral and principal chiefs, and that the general and indiscriminate slaughter of the Hugonots was the work of a bigotted and infuriated mob. That the original projectors ‘ stood aghast at the multitude of the slain,’ we do not believe; Charles at least was not of the number. Two days after the St Bartholomew, as he was returning from the Parliament, where he had renewed his prohibition of unlicensed slaughter by the mob, a Hugonot, discovered in the crowd, happened to be murdered so near his person, that, hearing the noise, he asked what was the matter, and being answered, it was only a Hugonot they were killing, he exclaimed, ‘ Go on, would to ‘ God he were the last ! ’ ‡ Papire Masson says of him, ‘ Rex ‘ ipse tragediam ex arce *letus animi* spectabat.’ § That he fired on his subjects, is told by Brantome and confirmed by Voltaire, on the authority of Marshal Tessé, who had heard the story from the page employed to load the fowling-piece he used on the occasion. Several contemporary authors mention it as a report, and add, that the persons on whom he fired, exclaiming, ‘ Tiron, mort Dieu, ils s’enfuyent,’ were Hugonots from the Fauxbourg St Germain, roused by the tumult, and hastening to his assistance, believing he had been attacked in his palace by the Guises. || But others, who relate this mistake of

\* Mezeray, ii. 1101.

† Petitot, 508—Brantome—Matthieu, 345—Mem. de l’Etat, i. 206. 212.

‡ Mem. de l’Etat, i. 229. De Serres, iv. 48.

§ Castlenau, iii. 16.

|| De Serres, iv. 40. Mem. de l’Etat, i. 212.



the Hugonots, which had nearly proved fatal to them, by retarding their flight, are silent on this act of the King. \*

That the savage nature of Charles, softened by illness, was assailed before his death with remorse for the cruelties of the St Bartholomew, may be credited on the respectable authorities that bear testimony of the fact; but during the massacre, and for some time afterwards, all feelings of humanity were suspended in his bosom, by a conflict of passions, in which rage and hatred predominated. While the attendants of the King of Navarre were slaughtered at the gate of the Louvre, he looked from a window on the massacre, feasting his eyes with the spectacle, and exclaiming to the murtherers to spare no one. † In the same evening, he sallied out of the palace with his mother and her ladies, and walked through the streets of Paris, stained with blood and carnage, while his fair companions, giggling and whispering, inspected the dead body of Soubise with a minuteness equally revolting to decency and humanity. ‡ Though recently in habits of familiar and apparently affectionate intercourse with the Admiral, he went, accompanied by his mother and courtiers, to Montfaucon, to contemplate the dead body of that nobleman suspended from the gallows; and, when one of his courtiers, offended by the smell, turned away his head, he exclaimed in the words of Vitellius, ‘Nothing so sweet as the stench of a dead enemy!’ § When Briquemaut and Cavagnes were executed, to give a colour to the pretended charges against the Protestants, he hastened from the apartment of his wife, who had been that morning delivered of her first child, to witness the scene from a window in the Hotel de Ville, to which he had the cruelty to drag the young King of Navarre, their friend; and as the night was growing dark, he desired torches to be held near them, ‘ut morientium ora certius videret!’ || and what is hardly credible, though related by a contemporary, ‘non sans faire des risées de la contenance de l’un et de l’autre!’ ¶ The fury to which he gave way on the St Bartholomew altered his character, but it was to make it more irascible and ferocious. When La Noue returned to Paris after the massacre, his friend, M. de Longueville, cautioned him to be on his guard in what he said to the King, ‘car vous ne parlerez plus au Roi doux et benin et gracieux que vous avez vu ci-devant, il est tout

---

\* Histoire Secrete de la Bourgogne. Avertissement preliminaire.

† De Serrcs, iv. 38.

‡ Ib. iv. 43.

§ Papiere Masson. Castlenau, iii. 16.

|| Ib. iii. 16.

¶ MSS. Bibl. du Roi, 324. St. Germ. f. 146.

‘changé, qu’on diroit qu’il n’a jamais eu de douceur.’ \* Walsingham says of him at the same period, ‘he is grown so bloody minded, that they that advised him thereto repent the same.† So far from being aghast at the extent of the slaughter, it was his boast, that ‘his fat Margaret (as he used to call his sister) had served as a mouse-trap to catch all his rebellious Hugonots.’ ‡ It was the general language at Court after the massacre, that *this* was the true way of settling with Hugonots, and not by edicts and negotiations. § The humanity of the King could not have been deeply wounded by the spectacle he had witnessed, when he permitted Coconas to boast in his presence, that he had rescued thirty Hugonots from the populace, to have the pleasure of making them first abjure their religion, and then stabbing them with his own hand. || On the 5th of September, twelve days after the commencement of the massacre, he sent for Pezou, a butcher, one of the captains of Paris, and asked him if he thought there were still any Hugonots left in the town, to which Pezou replied, that he had, the day before, thrown six score into the river, and that he had as many in reserve for the night following; ‘dout le roy se print à rire tout hautement, le renvoyant pour y pouvoir.’ ¶

We may judge, from these anecdotes, of the credit due to Bellievre, when, bemoaning to the Swiss cantons the extent of the massacre, he assures them it was not the fault of the King, whom he had seen on that occasion suffering marvellous pain, and doing every thing in his power to stay the fury of the populace. ‘Le Roi, M. le duc d’Anjou, M. le duc d’Alençon, et tous les princes de son sang et grands seigneurs s’y sont benignement et vertueusement employez. La Reine-mere y a pris une peine indicible.’ \*\* How strange, that so much cruelty should have been perpetrated, while so many great and illustrious personages were so actively and so benevolently employed!

We have not the private despatches of Bellievre to confront with his public harangues; but the correspondence of Montluc, bishop of Valence, who held a similar language in Poland, shows the true character of the French diplomacy of that age, and teaches us the little value to be placed on the public declarations of Charles, whether made to his own subjects or to foreign powers. Montluc has the effrontery to maintain, in pre-

\* Brantome, apud Castelnau, iii. 5.

† Digges. 279.

‡ Journal de l’Etoile, apud Petitot, xlv.—Satyre Menippée, i. 120.

§ De Serres, iv. 43.

|| Journal de l’Etoile, 85.

¶ Mem. de l’Etat. \*\* Mem. de Villeroy, iv. 330. Ed. of 1665.

sence of the Polish diet, (10th April 1573), that the Duke of Anjou had no hand in advising or conducting the massacre at Paris, and to assert, that he has a letter from that prince containing assurances, 'qu'il n'a été ni auteur ni approbateur de tel conseil;' \* he boasts of the mildness and humanity of the King, and instructs his agents at Warsaw (January 1573) to assure the Poles, that the Duke was gone to Rochelle, not to punish the insurgents, 'mais pour les concilier et assurer.' And yet at the same moment he writes to the King, (20th January 1573), 'Si vous pouviez ou faire ou *contrefaire* un edit contenant que vous n'entendez qu'aucun soit forcé de sa conscience en votre royaume, cela serviroit de beaucoup; et si vous avez l'intention contraire, vous le pouvez adresser aux gouverneurs qui en useroient depuis, après comme vous leur voudriez commander.' The people of Rochelle, he adds, deserve, it is true, the severest chastisement; but if you could only defer their punishment for a little while, it would be of the greatest service to your brother. If you proceed against them with rigour, even the Catholics here will not dare to stand by him. To Brulart, secretary of state, he writes by the same post, assuring him, that if news of any fresh act of cruelty arrive before the day of election, all the money he can send will not gain the suffrages of the Poles; and, as if doubtful of the effect of his remonstrances on the King and Queen-mother, he concludes by saying, 'Ils aviseront si une opinion de vengeance leur importe plus que l'acquisition d'un royaume.' † Montluc, be it remembered, was their confidential ambassador, understood their policy, and knew what was passing in their minds.

'The bloody scenes at Paris,' says Dr Lingard, 'were repeated at Orleans, Lyons, Rouen, Toulouse, and Bourdeaux; and the sufferers believed, that as they were not protected, they were persecuted by the commands of the Court. But the memory of Charles need not be loaded with additional infamy. There is no evidence that the other massacres had his sanction or permission.' Contemporary authors were of a different opinion; and the exclamation attributed to Charles by his brother, when he consented to the murder of the Admiral, favours their view of the question. Not to speak of the Italian authors, Capilupi, Adriani, and Davila, who ascribe the massacres in the provinces to secret orders from the Court, nor of the contemporary Hugonot writers, who are equally clear on that point—Papire Masson, a Catholic and a French-

---

\* Mem de l'Etat. ii. 159.

† MSS. Bibl. du Roi, Collection de Fontanieu, 327-328.

man, after giving an account of the St Bartholomew at Paris, says of the King, ‘*dedit continuo literas ad moderatores provinciarum, mandans reliquias defectorum cædi;*’\* and the Vicount of Tavannes, who, though young at the time of the massacre, lived afterwards in habits of intimacy with the chiefs of the League, while he laments the excess to which the work of destruction was carried in the provincial towns, admits that *orders were sent to them to put to death the chiefs and most factious of the Hugonots.* † The public orders of the King, it is true, prohibited his officers from permitting the massacre, imprisonment, or pillage of his Protestant subjects; but the flagrant and open disregard of these proclamations, convinced every attentive spectator, that his public edicts were accompanied by private instructions of a contrary tendency. ‘They pretend,’ says Walsingham, after describing the horrid scenes transacted in every part of France, ‘all this to be done against their will, though ‘it be evidently known that it is done by their commandment.’‡ The orders and instructions from Court, says de Thou, were differently interpreted in the provinces, according to the characters and political connections of the governors. Where the friends of the house of Montmorency were in authority, great moderation was exercised. ‘*Aliorum, ad quos secreta mandata, non scripto sed per emissarios data sunt, summa intemperies fuit, Parisiensem lanienam in exemplum trahentium.*’§ That the private instructions to extend the massacre of Paris to the provinces, in opposition to the public proclamations of the government, proceeded in every instance from Charles himself, it would be too much to affirm. Much was done by his mother, probably without his knowledge, ‘*Quelque furieux qu’il fut,*’ says a Hugonot writer, ‘*le roi ne servit que d’ombre aux passions cruelles de sa mere.*’ The deputies of Lyons, who happened to be at Paris during the massacre, wrote to their townsmen, that the Queen-mother had sent for them; and said, ‘*Qu’ils avoient vu comme ils en avoient usé à Paris, et qu’il ne tiendrait à eux qu’ils ne fissent le même à Lyon.*’|| But, that Charles had verbal communications with his governors, at one time commanding, at another time countermanding the massacre of the Hugonots, appears from the various and contradictory orders sent to the Count de Tende, and to his successor the Count de Carces in Provence:¶ And, that he de-

---

\* Castelnau, iii. 16.

† Tavannes, 419–466.

‡ Digges, 254, Letter to Burleigh, 8th Oct. 1572.

§ Thuanus, iii. 141.

|| Mem. de l’Etat. l. 259.

¶ Castlenau, ii. 15.

spatched verbal instructions to his governors at the time of the massacre, which he thought it necessary afterwards to retract, appears from his correspondence with M. de Longueville and M. de Matignon, to both of whom he writes in the following words: 'Au surplus, *quelque mandement verbal* que j'aye peu faire à ceux que j'aye envoyez, tant divers vous que autres gouverneurs et mes lieutenans generaulx et officiers, lors que j'avois juste occasion de m'alterer et craindre quelque sinistre evenement, ayant sceu la conspiration que faisoit à l'encontre de moy le dict Admiral, j'ay revoqué et revoque tout cela, ne voulant que par vous ne autre en soit aucune chose executé.' \*

When we examine in detail the massacres committed in the provincial towns, we discover an uniformity in the mode of proceeding, that indicates they were perpetrated on a general plan. We find, that on the first news of the St Bartholomew, the gates of the town were shut by public authority, so that no Protestant could escape, if so disposed. Murmurs and threats on the part of the populace generally followed; and then, on pretence of securing the Hugonots from their enemies, the great body of them were distributed in different prisons and convents, while some of the more obnoxious were murdered, and their houses given up to pillage. Messengers were sent to Paris for instructions; and on their return, or more frequently on the arrival of persons with real or pretended orders from Court, the prisons and other places of confinement for the Protestants were forced, and the prisoners within barbarously murdered—sometimes by an apparently unlicensed mob, and at other times by command of the public authorities of the town. At Lyons, the Governor contrived to be out of the way, while the principal massacre was going on; and when he reappeared, he had the effrontery to offer a reward for the detection of the perpetrators, who were at the time publicly parading the streets, with their garments dined in blood, boasting of the numbers they had slain! Caveyrac adduces this proclamation as a proof of the innocence and good intentions of the Governor;† but he forgets to add, that it made so little impression on the assassins, that, on the following night, they broke into the remaining prison, and completed the massacre they had begun. At Troyes the Protestants were butchered in prison, by order of the Bailli or chief magistrate of the place, after the arrival of a messenger from Paris; and next day, the proclamation which the mes-

---

\* MSS. Bibl. du Roi—324 Fontanieu—121 Dupuy.

† Caveyrac, iv.

senger had brought with him, was published, assuring them of security and protection. At Toulouse the magistrates kept their prisoners three weeks in confinement, till deputies from Paris brought orders, real or pretended, to put them to death. At Bourdeaux the massacre was begun by the Governor himself, who killed with his own hand the *Sieur de la Loubiere*, one of the *Conseillers* in the parliament of that city. Delays arose in some places, as at Rouen, from the unwillingness of the governors to be concerned in such acts of cruelty; and at Bourdeaux the assassins were restrained, though with difficulty, till the 3d of October, lest intelligence of the massacre should decide, as it did, the inhabitants of Rochelle to refuse admittance to the King's troops. Some governors refused, with indignation, to execute the orders they had received, and others employed different pretexts to excuse their disobedience. Among the higher clergy, the Bishop of Lisieux distinguished himself by his firmness and humanity, and prevented in his diocese the excesses that took place in other parts. \*

Caveyrac insists much on no orders having been sent to Montluc, Governor of Guienne, a confidential ally of the Queen-mother, and most determined-enemy of the Hugonots. † If such orders had been given, Montluc, he pretends, might possibly have refused to execute them; but with his usual frankness, he would certainly have mentioned them in his *Commentaries*. He forgets or conceals from his readers, that Montluc had been relieved from his government near two years before, and that he was living in retirement at the time of the St Bartholomew. But if the silence of Montluc affords no argument for Caveyrac, he is a dangerous witness to call into court. Montluc has no hesitation in expressing his opinion, that the court was insincere in its profession of amity to the Hugonots after the peace of 1570. 'Or, je disois tous jours en moi-même, *oyant les nouvelles de la cour, qu'on faisoit trop de caresses aux Huguenots, et connoissois bien qu'il y auroit du bruit au logis.*' When he hears of the massacre, his first impression is surprise at the indiscretion of the Admiral in trusting his person amidst his enemies; and when the Queen-mother writes to him of the conspiracy they had detected, the old man observes with a smile of incredulity, 'Je sçay bien ce que j'en crois! Il fait mauvais offenser son maitre. Le Roy n'oublia jamais quand Monsieur l'Admiral luy fit faire la traite de meaux à

---

\* Thuanus, iii. 141-145—Mem. de l'Etat. i. 235-386—De Serres, iv. 49-55—d'Aubigné, 560.

† Caveyrac, xxvii.

'Paris, plus vite que le pas.' Kings have better memories for injuries than for services. Of the massacre itself he declines to give an opinion. Like Sir Roger De Coverley, he thinks much may be said on both sides. Those who write at present, he adds, dare not tell more than half: For my part, I prefer saying nothing at all. \*

When Dr Lingard boasts of the moderation of the Catholics at Nismes, 'who remained quiet on this occasion,' † he forgets there was no Royal garrison in the place, and that the Hugonots were the stronger party in the town. He might have learned from Menard, to whom he refers, that in the following war, Nismes was one of the towns that remained in arms against the King. Of the massacres of the Catholics at Nismes, to which he alludes, that of 1567, called the Michelade, was undoubtedly a most atrocious and deliberate act; that of 1569, which he improperly calls a massacre in cold blood, was not more than usually happens in civil wars, when a place is taken by surprise and pillaged. But, though he appears to have had Menard before his eyes, he is again misled by trusting to Caveyrac.

Proceeding on his plan of attenuating, by all possible means, our horror of the St Bartholomew, Dr Lingard reduces the number of victims throughout France to less than 1600. He forgets that his friend Caveyrac had reprinted an extract from the Archives of the Hotel de Ville of Paris, by which it appears, that, during the eight days preceding the 13th of September 1572, eleven hundred dead bodies had been interred in the neighbourhood of St Cloud, Autuil, and Chaillot. The persons employed in this service, it may be remarked, were the grave-diggers of St Innocents; the sum paid for their trouble was 35 livres Tournais, amounting to about 110 francs of the present money of France; and the motive for employing them on the part of the town, was the fear of infection from the number of putrid bodies lying unburied in its vicinity. ‡ The much greater numbers interred near Paris, between the 24th of August and 5th of September, were of course not included in this account; nor the bodies carried by the river below St Cloud, which must have been buried at the places where they were deposited by the stream. A zealous Catholic, who published a metrical account of the St Bartholomew soon after the massacre, laments that so many Hugonots were still in prison, who ought to be serving the King in his garrisons, or

Au gibet, ou comme les autres par eau  
Envoyez à Rouen sans bateau. §

\* Montluc. iv. 339, 343, 12mo.

† Lingard, viii. 520.

‡ Sauval, Histoire de Paris, iii. 634.

§ Deluge des Huguenots. Paris, Oct. 3d 1572. 12mo.

But the conclusion of Dr Lingard is not more improbable, than his mode of arriving at it extraordinary. After extracting from Caveyrac the estimates of the number of victims collected from different authors by the Abbé, he adds from himself: ‘ But the Martyrologist adopted a measure, which may enable us to form a conjecture. He procured from the ministers in the different towns, lists of the names of the persons who had suffered, or were supposed to have suffered. He published the result in 1582; and the reader will be surprised to learn, that he could discover the names of no more than 786 persons. Perhaps, if we double that number, we shall not be very far from the real amount.’\* Why, it may be asked, double the number? If such uncommon industry was really used to obtain an accurate list of the sufferers, why add to it at all? What possible motive could possess the Calvinist ministers to withhold from their martyrologist the names of one half of their martyrs? But, where has Dr Lingard discovered, that the Protestant Martyrologist, as he calls him, took such extraordinary pains to procure accurate lists of the victims? We have searched with care through the work, to which we suppose he refers, because it is the book referred to by Caveyrac; but we have found in it no mention of such inquiries as he describes—no traces of diligent research—no pretensions to give complete lists of the sufferers.† ‘ Nous marquerons les noms de quelques particuliers,’ say the authors, ‘ entre tant de milliers de personnes de toutes qualites mises à mort.’—‘ Nous ajouterons maintenant ceux dont nous avons eu memoire, avec quelques circonstances au massacre d’aucuns. Ce n’est qu’un bien petit echantillon, car il faudroit un gros livre et du temps beacoup pour sçavoir la verité par le menu.’—‘ Nous particulariserons quelque petit nombre de gens emportez par ces furieux massacres.’—‘ Ayant recouvré de quelques bons personnages les noms de quelquesuns qui furent lors massacrez (at Lyons) je les ay ici inserez.’ They repeatedly call on others, who have better means of information, to complete their list of the victims; and so

---

\* Lingard, viii. 520.

† The title of this book is ‘ Histoire des Martyrs persecutez et mis à mort pour la verité de l’Evangile, depuis le temps des Apostres jusqu’à present. Geneva, 1619, folio.’ We have not been able to procure the Edition of 1582; but the one we have examined, we are assured, is the most complete of any. The first edition of the work appeared in 1554, under the title of ‘ Livre des Martyrs depuis Jean Hus jusqu’à 1554. The edition of 1619 was edited by Simon Goulart of Senlis, one of the ministers of Geneva.



far from having taken extraordinary pains to make their catalogue accurate and perfect, they have actually copied nine-tenths of the names they have given from the 'Memoires de l'Etat sous Charles IX.,' published in 1578; and in the only instance where they have departed from that work, which in general they have servilely abridged, they profess to be indebted for their information to a pious *Catholic* of Orleans, a canon of St Croix, who witnessed and was shocked at the massacres committed by his townsmen. \*

How and where then, it may be asked, could Dr Lingard's circumstantial mistake originate? We beg his pardon if we are in the wrong, but we suspect he has been misled by a passage in Caveyrac. That author, who *had* seen and consulted the book he quotes, *supposes* that the Martyrologist must have made minute inquiries into the names and number of the victims. 'Il faut *supposer* que l'auteur a recherché et conservé avec soin ces noms précieux à la secte, et les moyens ne durent pas lui manquer.' † Now, we suspect that Dr Lingard, reading with more than usual haste his Caveyrac, has converted the supposition of the Abbé into an assertion; and, in adding the other circumstances of the story, that he has been seduced into an imitation of the philosophic historians whom he abuses, and borrowed from his fancy what was wanting to support and complete his theory.

If we are asked why so few names have been preserved of the many thousands that perished, we reply, that no pains were used to collect them at the time, the survivors being too much occupied with their own danger to record the cruelties they witnessed on others; and that the collections made afterwards by Sully, were purposely suppressed, and probably destroyed. ‡ Of five or six *Conseillers au parlement* murdered at Toulouse, and afterwards suspended from an elm-tree in the court-yard of the palace, dressed in their parliamentary robes, not one is named by the Martyrologist, and only one by De Thou. § Accident, as in the case of the Catholic priest at Orleans, has supplied the greater part of the names that have been preserved. Left to conjecture as to the numbers that perished, authors have differed widely in the estimates they have given. Papire Masson and Tavannes reduce the number slain in Paris to 2000; De Thou makes them 2000 during the first day only; D'Aubigné raises the whole to 3000; Capilupi pretends that

---

\* Histoire des Martyrs, 779, 781, 788, 791.

† Caveyrac, xxxvii.

‡ *Œconomics*, l. 14. folio.

§ Thuanus, l. 145.

3000 were slain in a few hours; Brantome makes the total 4000; De Serres and the *Memoires de l'Etat* increase the number to 10,000; and Davila, in giving the same estimate, adds, that among them were 500 barons, *cavallieri*, and military officers. Bellievre, in his discourse to the Swiss, pretends, that at the time of the massacre, there were 800 Hugonot gentlemen in Paris, and 8000 common persons; and as we know that few gentlemen escaped, it would follow, that of persons of condition the number that perished was quite as great as stated by Davila; but the discourse of Bellievre is so replete with falsehoods, that no dependance can be placed on it. Adriani makes 1500 murdered at Paris in the first day, as many more in the two following days, and 400 gentlemen in all. Perefice reckons that more than 20 *seigneurs de marque* were slain at Paris, 1200 gentlemen, and from 3 to 4000 of inferior condition.

Papire Masson calculates the whole number of victims throughout France, exclusive of Paris, at 10,000; La Popelinière gives 20,000 as the total; Adriani, De Serres, and De Thou, 30,000; Davila 40,000; Sully 70,000, and Perefice 100,000. If obliged to choose amidst these conflicting opinions, we should prefer trusting to the judgment and caution of De Thou.

Having exhausted our remarks on Dr Lingard's account of the St Bartholomew, we shall proceed to other parts of his work, where he treats of the history of the French Protestants, in which we shall find errors and misrepresentations not less remarkable, nor less worthy of notice. We shall follow no regular order in our observations, but take up the different subjects as they occur to us.

Dr Lingard relates, with complacency, what he calls the shrewd reply of the Queen-mother to a supposed application in favour of the Hugonots, by Walsingham, the English Ambassador at Paris, at the desire of his mistress; but he has so altered and disfigured the story, that the conversation he relates has little or no resemblance to the truth.\* In the first place, it is not true, that Elizabeth, through her ambassador, 'had recommended to the protection of Charles, the persons and worship of the French Protestants.' The conversation, in which Catherine 'made her shrewd reply,' occurred on the 14th of September, before Walsingham had received instructions of any sort from his court, after the massacre; and therefore, if he had made any application on behalf of the Hugonots, it must have been of his own authority: But he made no such application. The Queen-mother having sent for him, to hear and remove his scruples

---

\* Lingard, viii. 116.

about the projected marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Alençon, desired him to assure his mistress, that it was the King's intention the edict of pacification should remain in force. But, 'in what sort?' inquired the ambassador. 'They shall enjoy the liberty of their conscience,' answered Catherine—'and the exercise of their religion too?' replied Walsingham.—'No, my son will have exercise but of one religion in his realm.' But how, urged the ambassador, does that refusal agree with the observation of the edict, which secures to them liberty of worship? 'Will you have them live without exercise of religion?' 'Even,' saith she, 'as your Mistress suffereth the Catholics of England.'—'My mistress did never promise them any thing by edict; if she had, she would not fail to have performed it.'\* We leave our readers to judge which party had the advantage in this colloquy.

What can be more unfair, in the impression it is calculated to convey to a careless reader, than Dr Lingard's mention of the assassination of Lignerolles? 'The leaders of the French Protestants,' he informs us, 'forwarded the project' (of marriage between Elizabeth and the Duke of Anjou), 'with all their influence. Lignerolles, the Duke's favourite, and the supposed enemy of the match, was assassinated; and a confident hope was entertained, that the Prince, no longer under his influence, would accede to the proposed terms.'† Who would not understand, from this passage, that Lignerolles had been assassinated by contrivance of the French Protestants, because he opposed the marriage of the Duke of Anjou with Queen Elizabeth? But Dr Lingard knows, or ought to know, that Lignerolles was murdered by direction of Charles IX., with the knowledge and consent of his brother, the Duke of Anjou, and that his assassins were Catholics, and not Protestants. Various reasons have been assigned for this murder, but among them we have not met with the one insinuated by Dr Lingard. The prevailing opinion is, that Lignerolles, having been intrusted by the Duke of Anjou with the secret designs of the Court against the Hugonots, had imprudently, in conversation with the King, shown he was in possession of the secret; and that Charles, unwilling an affair of such importance should be known to any one who was not of his council, after reproaching his brother sharply for his indiscretion, determined on the immediate murder of Lignerolles, which he effected, by sending for the Vicomte de la Guerche, and directing him to assassinate that gentleman without delay. The King affected

---

\* Digges, 242.

† Lingard, viii. 93.

to be deeply incensed at the murder, imprisoned the assassins, and appeared to be, with difficulty, prevented from proceeding rigorously against them; but after the St Bartholomew, says Le Laboureur, 'on ne soucia plus de faire mystere de ce meurtre.'\* Other explanations have been given of this assassination. Some pretend, that he had attempted to excite dissensions in the royal family; † others, that he fell a sacrifice to the resentment of a lady connected with the Duke of Anjou. ‡ Some say that he was too much beloved by a Princess; § and others, that he had boasted indiscreetly of a lady's favours. || Walsingham's correspondence, to which Dr Lingard refers his readers, describes him as an instrument employed by the House of Guise, and the rest of the Spanish faction, to prevent the marriage, and represents his death 'as no small furtherance to the cause;' but contains nothing to colour or justify the insinuation, that he fell a victim to the resentment of the Hugonots. ¶

In his account of the interview at Bayonne, between the Queen of Spain and the Duke of Alva on the one side, and the Queen-mother of France and her son Charles on the other, Dr Lingard has taken liberties with the authorities he cites, not less unwarrantable than those he has used on the St Bartholomew.

In a note professing to examine into the truth of the supposed league of the Catholic Princes at Bayonne, 'for the extirpation, first of the Protestants in France, and then of the Protestants in other countries,' he tells us, on the authority of letters from Philip of Spain to his sister the Dutchess Margaret, the substance of which has been published by Strada, 'that the French monarch professed a determination to support the Catholic faith.'\*\* What! no more than an innocent determination to support the Catholic faith! What says Strada, who had no motive to exaggerate, and no intention to suppress the truth? From a letter of Philip to his sister, of the 25th of September (1565), he informs us, '*Hispaniæ reginam multis gravissimisque rationibus, haud dubie a Philippo imperatis, laboranti per Galliam religioni remedium a fratre, a parente, quorum præcipue intererat, efflagitasse; illosque quam optime animatos ad ea, quæ agitata sunt, consilia reperisse.*' Marriages were proposed, and an alliance suggested against the Turks; but nothing was settled, '*regina declinante omnia præter causam religionis, quam, quum iterum, Albano suggerente, commendasset, utrinque discessam est.*' The his-

---

\* Castelnau, i. 776.—Davila, i. 270—Matthieu, 935.

† Tavannes, 378.

‡ Matthieu, 343.

§ Thuan. iii. 66.

|| Mezeray, ii. 1078.

¶ Digges, 161.

\*\* Lingard, viii. 71.

torian adds, that many have thought the massacre of the heretics at Paris, executed seven years afterwards, was planned at this interview; 'id quod mihi neque abnuere neque affirmare promptum fuerit, *potius inclinât animus ut credam.*' He is also of opinion, that the mutual aid, afterwards given by the two crowns against their heretical subjects, was settled there; 'nam Philippus, illa, quam dicebam, epistola, innuit aliquod *de hujusmodi subsidiis ad profligandam hæresim mutuo in posterum submitteendis.*' \*

It appears from these extracts that something more passed at this interview than a mere profession on the part of the French King of his 'determination to support the Catholic faith;' that his sister repeatedly urged him and her mother to apply some remedy to the *suffering* state of religion in France,—that is, suffering from impatience of the toleration, imperfect as it was, accorded to the Protestants by the peace of 1563; that she found them exceedingly well disposed to follow the counsels, which at the suggestion of her husband she had recommended; and that a mutual understanding had taken place between the two Kings, to assist each other in future against their heretical subjects. It appears also, that the historian, who perused this correspondence, of which we have only his abstract, was inclined to believe, that the massacre of St Bartholomew was concerted at this meeting. How far the suppression of these particulars is reconcileable with the candour and good faith to be expected from an historian, we leave our readers to decide.

Dr Lingard is at pains to inform us, that 'the meeting was solicited by the King of France, and reluctantly acceded to by Philip.' It is true, that it was with reluctance Philip consented to this meeting; but, after it had been settled, he was inclined to attend. Strada informs us of this fact, and that it was in the hope of rendering some effectual service to the Catholic cause, that he was disposed, even at the risk of his dignity, to be there in person: 'Et sane rogatum ab Isabella uxore, *ut præsentia sua gaudium cumlaret; haud alienum se ostendisse certum habeo ex ejus literis ad gubernatricem, (3d February).*' His sister having dissuaded him from going, lest he should expose himself among the French to familiarities derogatory from his dignity, he replied, (3d March), 'Si doceatur ad religionem pertinere, ut ipse intersit, decretum sibi jam tum esse, pro Dei causa nullis sese molestiis periculisve subtrahere.' He was prevented after all from attending, by the news of the siege of Malta, as he wrote to the Dutchess

---

\* Famiana Strada de Bello Belgico, 109—Romæ 1632.

(27th September); or, as the historian, from a knowledge of his character, shrewdly conjectures, ‘*ex longinquo melius responsa daturus;*’ and for the same reason he withheld from the Queen the power of concluding any thing without first consulting him by letter.

Dr Lingard boasts, that ‘*of this league no satisfactory evidence has ever been produced.*’ If he means that the articles of the treaty have never been published, he is in the right. They were probably never reduced to writing. But, if the concurrent opinions of the best informed writers of the age, Catholic as well as Protestant, be admitted as an evidence of an historical fact, there can be no doubt that plans were discussed, and measures projected at Bayonne, for the destruction of heresy in France.

Adriani, a contemporary historian of eminence and credit, informs us of the private conferences of the Queen-mother and the Duke of Alva at Bayonne, on the means of delivering France from heretics. ‘*Et in ultimo si attenero al consiglio del Re Catolico, esposto dal duca d’Alva, che non se potesse ciò fare senza la morte di tutti i capi de gli Ugonotti, et fare, secondo il proverbio, un vespro Siciliano; et finalmente resolverono, como il Re tornasse a Molins nel Borbonese, dove si credeva essere abitazione per il Re in azzione di tanta importanza forte et sicura, di far quivi questa strage, che segui poi l’anno 1572, in Parigi il giorno di San Bartolomeo, al quel tempo si reservo tale esecuzione, per alcuni sospetti, che apparivano negli Ugonotti, et per difficulta di condurvegli tutti, et ancora perche piu sicuro luogo era Parigi che Molins.*’ \* Adriani is supposed to have derived the materials for his history from the Journal of Cosmo, Grand Duke of Tuscany, who died in 1574. †

Davila, whose family enjoyed the favour and confidence of the Queen-mother, informs us, that at Bayonne both parties were agreed on the destruction of heresy; but that Alva recommended at once to cut off the heads of the tallest poppies, to catch the large fish and let the small fry alone, saying, one salmon was worth a hundred frogs; while she ‘*riserbando questo per ultimo partito,*’ wished if possible to prevent the effusion of blood, and by peaceable means to bring back the Hugonot chiefs to the church. They parted, he says, with the resolution to lend one another mutual aid, but each to take his own course, and to pursue the plan that seemed best adapted to his situation. ‡

---

\* Storia, ii. 1320, Ed. of 1583.

† Thuan. ii. 435.

‡ Davila, l. 148, Ed. of 1644.

The author of the *Memoires of Tavannes*, whose authority Dr Lingard will hardly decline, says expressly, that at Bayonne the Queens of France and Spain, and the Duke of Alva, came to the resolution of extirpating heresy both in France and Flanders; and in stating the reasons of the Protestants for their enterprise at Meaux, assigns the principal place to the impression left on their minds by the interview of Bayonne. 'Les synodes deffendus,' he observes, 'les meurtres impunis, les modifications de l'edit de pacification, ne mirent tant en soupçon les Huguenots que l'assemblée de Bayonne; là ou il fut resolu, que les deux couronnes se protegeroient, maintiendroient la religion Catholique, ruineroient leurs rebelles, et que les chefs seditieux seroient attrapez et justiciez: ' and with the same candour he acknowledges, that the levy of Swiss, on pretence of guarding against the Duke of Alva, was made by the Queen-mother 'pour s'assurer.' \*

It is well known, that the advance of these Swiss into the interior of France, after the Duke of Alva had passed into Flanders, was the immediate cause or pretext of the insurrection of the Protestants. Castelnau, who had so great a share in defeating their enterprise, says it was undertaken on an opinion 'vray semblable ou imaginaire,' that their destruction was in contemplation; and his commentator Le Laboureur more decidedly asserts, that the Hugonots were 'bien avertis de la ligue qu'on brassoit contre eux presque à decouvert depuis l'entrevue de Bayonne.' †

In what degree the Protestants were informed of the secret resolutions taken at Bayonne, it is more difficult to decide. That they had suspicions, confirmed by the subsequent conduct of the government towards them, is most certain; ‡ but to what extent they were informed of the particular designs entertained to their prejudice, is not so clear. Without adopting the whole of the story told by Matthieu, § of the private consultations between Alva and the Queen-mother, overheard by the Prince of Bearn, and by him repeated to his mother, it is not impossible that some of the expressions imputed to Alva may have dropped from him in presence of the young Prince; and retained by him on account of their singularity, that they may have been repeated to others who could better affix a meaning to them.

Since writing the above, we have perused in the *Memoires de Nevers*, || the original of this story in a memoir of Calignon,

\* Tavannes, 282-296. † Castelnau, i. 189-213—ii. 344-456.

‡ Pasquier, *Œuvres*, ii. 110.

§ Matthieu, 283.

|| *Mém. de Nevers*, ii. 577.

Chancellor of Navarre, which converts our conjecture into certainty. Calignon relates, nearly in the words of Matthieu, the account given to him by Henry IV. of the conversations he overheard between the Queen-mother and the Duke of Alva. Much was said about the extirpation of heresy; and the expression of Alva, 'qu'une tête de Saumon valoit mieux que celles de cent grenouilles,' having struck the imagination of the young Prince, remained engraved on his memory.

La Noue also, an author of the highest credit, enumerates, among the reasons for the enterprise at Meaux, 'La resolution prise à Bayonne avec le duc d'Alve d'exterminer les Huguenots de France et les Gueux de Flandre, de quoy on avoit été averti par ceux de qui on ne se doutoit pas.' La Noue adds, that before their final resolution was taken, the Hugonots held three several meetings, at the two first of which it was decided, chiefly by the influence of the Admiral, to remain quiet; but at the third, it was determined to take up arms, certain information having been received from Court that it was resolved, in the Secret Council, to arrest the Prince of Condé and the Admiral, to shut up the one in prison, and to put the other to death. \*

Similar confederacies against the Protestants had been in agitation among the Catholic Princes at a still earlier period. When William, Prince of Orange, went to France as an hostage after the peace of Cateau Cambresis, he was told by Henry II., with whom he was in habits of familiarity, that the Duke of Alva had proposed to him a scheme for the extermination of heresy, not only in France and Flanders, but throughout all Christendom. Not suspecting the secret bias of the prince in favour of the reformed religion, the King talked to him freely of their design, and of the means for carrying it into execution. Part of their plan was, to establish an Inquisition in the Low Countries, more severe than that of Spain. †

There is a mode of telling a story, that, without being positively false, conveys an impression very different from the truth. Dr Lingard, when he chooses, is an adept in that art. He informs us, that after the conferences at Poissy, the Catholics 'were joined by the King of Navarre and the Queen Regent, with her son.' ‡ It is true, that some time after the conferences at Poissy, the Catholics were joined by the King of Navarre; but it is not true that they were joined by the Queen

---

\* La Noue, 606.

† Apologie du Guillaume, Prince d'Orange—Dumont, i. 384.

‡ Lingard, vii. 417.



Regent and her son till five months afterwards; and then, not voluntarily, but by compulsion. In the interval, the Queen-mother had united herself closely with the Prince of Condé and the Admiral; the edict of January 1562, in favour of the Calvinists, had been passed by her influence, and that of the Chancellor de l'Hopital; the massacre of Vassy had been perpetrated, and the Prince of Condé driven from Paris by the triumvirate. In this posture of affairs, the King of Navarre and Duke of Guise repaired with an armed force to Fontainebleau, where the young King was residing with his mother, and insisted on taking him to Paris. The Queen entreated and remonstrated, but in vain. She was told the King's presence was necessary at Paris; but for her, if the air of Fontainebleau agreed with her, she might stay where she was. Before yielding to this violence, she despatched repeated couriers to the Prince of Condé, urging him to hasten to her assistance, and have pity on her son, who was a prisoner in the hands of his subjects, 'l'assurant qu'il seroit avoué de tout ce qu'il feroit.' The Prince of Condé not arriving in time, the King was dragged to Paris, 'temoignant par ses larmes que c'étoit contre son gré.\*

So manifest was his repugnance to this forcible abduction, that the son of Marshal Tavannes acknowledges in his *Mémoires*, that his father, 'voyant les corps de leurs Majestez entre les mains des uns, et leurs esprits avec les autres, estoit en doute quel party sa Majesté etant majeur approuveroit, de la reine sa mere et des Huguenots, ou du roi de Navarre, Messieurs de Guise et Connctable de Montmorency, qui l'avoient mené par force à Paris.' And so contradictory were the orders, which he continued for some time after to receive from the Queen-mother on the one side, and from the Duke of Guise on the other, with respect to the treatment of the Hugonots in his government, that he sent a gentleman to Court to request their Majesties would speak their mind freely, without disguise or dissimulation, and let him know frankly what they would have him do, promising unlimited obedience to their commands, and professing his readiness to support whichever party they preferred.† When we find a man like Tavannes, afterwards so determined and furious a partisan of the Catholics, wavering and indifferent at that period, it shows on how slender a basis the established religion stood, and how easily it might have been subverted, if the King and his mother had fallen into the hands of the Prince of Condé, instead of being carried away prisoners to Paris by the opposite faction.

---

\* Mezeray, ii. 841.

† Tavannes, 250.

To the daring violence of the Duke of Guise, the Catholics were therefore indebted for their possession of the King and of his mother, and for their subsequent adherence to the Catholic cause. But, though in the hands of the Catholics, it was some time before the Queen-mother was reconciled to a party which had treated her with so little ceremony, and shown so little regard to her wishes. Towards the end of the following summer, letters from her to the Dutchess of Savoy were intercepted by Tavannes, \* which disclosed her secret inclination to favour the Hugonots at their expense. It was not till the death of the Duke of Guise that she espoused in earnest their cause.

Dr Lingard treats the massacre of Vassy with unbecoming levity. He calls it 'an affray, in which about sixty men were 'slain by the followers of the Duke of Guise.' † He forgets, that besides sixty slain, there were above two hundred wounded; that many of the sufferers were women and children; that the Catholics were armed men; the Protestants unarmed, and employed at their devotions. We agree with De Thou, that on the part of the Duke of Guise the affair was accidental. His exclamation after the massacre, that with his sword he would cut in two the Edict of Toleration, was uttered in a passion, and must not be construed into an approbation of what had passed. But if we acquit that gallant Prince of the premeditated slaughter of an unarmed and defenceless congregation, we see no reason to believe, that the affray, as Dr Lingard calls it, was 'provoked by the religionists themselves;' nor will he find sufficient ground for that assertion in the work of La Popelinière, to which he refers his readers. That author leaves the matter in doubt. De Thou makes the Catholics the aggressors. The excuse of Brantome, even if it were true, is ridiculous. It might have been uncivil in the Hugonots not to stop their psalm-singing while the Duke was hearing mass; but it was no reason for his lacqueys and pages to insult them, nor for his men-at-arms and arquebuziers to break into their barn, fire at their minister in the midst of his sermon, and murder and mangle all they could find. ‡

To this affray Dr Lingard informs us, 'the French reformers and writers generally ascribe the war' that followed; he might have added, and the Catholic writers too. Even Tavannes admits, that the Hugonots had reason to complain of having been

\* Tavannes, 253.

† Thuan, ii. 161—Davila, i. 87—Brantome—Castelnau, i. 81, 760.

‡ Lingard, vii. 417—La Popelinière, ii. 67.

attacked and slaughtered contrary to the edict of toleration.\* De Thou, after relating with his usual moderation this melancholy event, adds, 'Sic prudentissimus quisque existimabat *'hinc seditionis factum initium, et factiosos, tota Gallia, quasi classico, ad arma capienda incitatos.'*† 'On peut regarder *'ce massacre,'* says a writer quoted by Dr Lingard, *'comme le signal des guerres civiles et des cruautés qui regnerent depuis en France sur le fait de la religion.'*‡ But Dr Lingard, it seems, has detected a fact, which proves that, before the affair of Vassi, the Protestants of Languedoc had made preparations for war, and had actually risen in arms. 'The affray,' he tells us, 'happened on March 1st; yet the Calvinists at Nismes began to arm on the 19th of February at the sound of the drum. They were in the field, and defeated de Flassans on March 6th.'§ For this discovery, we are referred to Menard's History of Nismes, who has preserved and recorded the fact, though not aware, as it appears, of the consequences to be drawn from it. Looking to Menard, we find in his proofs, at the page marked by Dr Lingard, the Journal of Jean Deyran, in which it is stated, that on Thursday the 19th of February, *'M. de Cardet fit sonner taborin à Nismes, pour amasser compagnie pour aller au service du Roi en Provence à Brignoles, du mandement du Sieur Comte de Crussol, lieutenant du Roy general en Languedoc,'* and that on Friday the 6th of March, a battle was fought at Barjou in Provence, in which Flassin and the Flassinists were defeated and dispersed. It appears then that the levy in arms at Nismes, on the 19th of February, was by a recruiting party, under a commission from the King; and that the Flassinists, whose fate Dr Lingard seems to deplore, were rebels against the Royal authority. The history of the transaction, as related by Menard, is as follows. The Count de Crussol having been sent into the south of France, with a commission to restore tranquillity in that part of the kingdom, found some refractory Catholics in Provence, under the Sieur de Flassans, who refused to lay down their arms. Provoked by their obstinacy, the Count de Crussol marched into Provence with a body of troops to reduce them to obedience, and ordered levies to be made in Languedoc for the expedition. The Sieur de Cardet came to Nismes by his orders; and having completed his levy, he passed the Rhone, and defeated the Flassinists at Barjols. From this account it appears, that if troops were raised by beat

\* Tavannes, 219.

† Thuan. ii. 163.

‡ Menard, Hist. de Nismes, iv. 342.

§ Lingard, vii. 417.

of drum at Nismes before the affair of Vassi, it was under a commission from the King; and if an action was fought at Barjols, it was by order of his lieutenant-general. \*

We are tired, and so probably are our readers, with tracing Dr Lingard through his numerous mistakes and misrepresentations; and if the instances of carelessness and bad faith, which we have collected from so small a portion of his book, are insufficient to convince them that truth is neglected in his history, and that prejudice and partiality usurp its place, we despair of producing conviction. We are still of opinion, that his work shows, in general, much reading and research, and exhibits talents of no ordinary sort for historical criticism; and that to a student of English history, who will examine for himself the statements of historians, it is a valuable work, were it for no other reason than because it questions so many received opinions. But, to ordinary readers, unacquainted with the history of their country, who believe what they read because they find it written, it is a work of the most dangerous description, which will impress their minds with false and incorrect notions of the history of their country, and of the character and conduct of their ancestors. Let them recollect, that there is no fact to be credited without examination, no impression to be received without doubt, on the mere authority of Dr Lingard's statements.

Before concluding this paper, we propose to make some further remarks on the St Bartholomew, which has already occupied so many of our pages.

Of this most atrocious massacre, on which de Thou has justly observed—*‘nullum similis sævitie exemplum in tota antiquitate, evolutis gentium annalibus, reperiri’*—one of the shortest and most faithful, and certainly the most eloquent description, has been given in a Discourse addressed to the Swiss Cantons, in reply to the notorious falsehoods, unwillingly advanced in justification of his Court, by Bellievre, ambassador from France.

“In France,” says the author of this paper, “in the month of August last, thirty thousand persons were massacred within a few days. They were not slain in open battle, but in the bosom of peace. They were not armed and arrayed for fight; but were naked and asleep, or in a suppliant posture, bent on their knees, petitioning for mercy from their assassins. They were not assembled in a body, but dispersed in their separate houses and places of residence. This was not done by order

---

\* Menard, iv. 336—*Preuves*, 6.

of justice, or by course of law; but by the rage and violence of a furious populace, let loose from restraint. Among the victims were many persons confined by sickness, or impotent from age, many honourable ladies and virtuous damsels of rank and family, many women with child, many youths entering on life, and many helpless children, many holy and learned men whose avocations excluded them from the profession of arms. Thousands terrified at these massacres, which seemed to them like a sudden and unheard of visitation of Providence, have fled from their houses, abandoned their wives and children, and sought refuge in England, Germany, and Switzerland. Magnificent and powerful lords, ye and your subjects know that these things are true ! ”

Of the traits of individual ferocity exhibited in this bloody execution, we shall select but one example. A soldier, having the child of a Hugonot in his arms, was proceeding with it towards the river. The infant, unaware of its danger, smiled in his face, and played with his beard. Instead of being diverted from his purpose by its caresses, the savage plunged his dagger into its body, and threw it, streaming with blood, into the Seine. Such are the dire effects of religious fanaticism—the most dangerous passion that can find entrance into the human bosom, because it veils its odious features under the mask of duty, and hardens the heart that admits it, by enlisting conscience on its side. Whoever harbours this fatal inmate, and no religious sect has been exempt from it, be he Protestant or Catholic, wants only power and provocation to imitate the horrors of the St Bartholomew. The only preservative from the invasions of this monster, is religious freedom. The multiplication of sects, if it does not change the heart of the tiger, at least opposes bars to his fury, and reduces him to growl in his den, instead of springing on his foes to devour them.

Before entering on the question to which we are about to proceed, it may be useful to remind our readers, that in August 1570, peace was concluded by the King of France with his Hugonot subjects; that soon after he made a proposal of marriage between his sister Margaret and Henry, Prince of Bearn, afterwards Henry IV. of France; that in September 1571, the Admiral de Coligny, the real leader of the Hugonot party, was prevailed on to visit the Court at Blois, where he was received with great respect, and apparent cordiality, by the King; that in July 1572, a number of Hugonot nobles and gentlemen, repaired to Paris, for the celebration of the nuptials between Margaret and the Prince of Bearn, now King of Navarre, by the death of his mother; that on the 18th of August following,

the marriage was concluded; that on the 22d, the life of the Admiral was attempted by a private assassin; and that, on the 24th, the massacre of St Bartholomew was perpetrated.

The question for consideration is, whether, in making peace with the Protestants in 1570, the Court was sincere in its professions of intending to put an end to civil dissensions in France, by giving religious freedom to the Hugonots, or meant, under the mask of friendship, to entrap and destroy the leaders of that party, in the hope that, when the chiefs were cut off, their followers would be induced, by fear or seduction, to return into the bosom of the Church.

That schemes for overreaching and taking by surprise the chiefs of the Hugonots, were in agitation among the Catholics after the peace of 1570, appears from authorities that cannot be disputed; but that the Court continued to act systematically on that plan, from the conclusion of the peace to the massacre of St Bartholomew, which was the completion of the project, is a point that will require a longer and more difficult discussion.

Annexed to the Memoirs of William de Saulx, eldest son of Marshal Tavannes, there is a confidential communication made by his father to the King, after the peace of 1570. In this paper, the Marshall takes it for granted, that no person can be so absurd as to believe or wish that the present state of things in France will last; and thereupon he discusses in what manner hostilities are likely to be renewed. He pronounces, that the war will recommence by one party attempting to seize on the chief persons of the opposite side, and recommends various precautionary measures to the King and his brothers, to guard them from sudden attack. With respect to the Hugonots, he observes, that to surprise the places they possess, to extinguish their religion, or to break their alliances with foreign powers, is impossible. 'Ainsi, il n'y a moyen que de prendre les chefs tout à la fois, pour y mettre un fin.'—'Les choses,' he adds, 'sont en bon train pour venir au dessus des affaires, pourvu que l'on ne se laisse attraper; et leur faut tenir parole, pour ne leur donner occasion de prendre les armes.'\*

The policy here recommended by Tavannes, is precisely that which the Court is charged by its enemies with having followed; viz. to quiet the suspicions of the Hugonots by a faithful execution of the treaty, and to take advantage of the confidence inspired by that conduct, to bring together and secure their chiefs. Be it remembered, that when this opinion

---

\* Mem. de Guillaume de Saulx, Seigneur de Tavannes, 81.

was given, Tavannes 'sans grade, gouvernoit l'état.'\* Brantome relates of him, that judging of the difficulty that would be found to reduce the Hugonots by open force, from the resistance they made at Montcontour, he decided, 'qu'il y falloit venir par la voye du renard,' and with that view advised the peace of 1570, 'et au bout de quelque tems la St Barthelemi s'inventa,—de la quelle M. de Tavannes avec le Comte de Retz furent les principaux auteurs.'† In another passage, Brantome repeats his assertion, that it was Tavannes who advised the Queen to make the peace of 1570, 'non qu'il la desiroit autrement, sinon d'autant pour se preparer mieux à la fête de S. Barthelemi, et attirer à soi par ce moyen M. l'Admiral à Blois et à Paris, comme il fit.'‡ The Viscount de Tavannes, on the contrary, maintains that, after the battle of Montcontour, his father recommended a vigorous prosecution of the war, and that this advice was defeated by the artifices of the Cardinal of Lorraine, who inspired the King with jealousy of his brother; and that it was owing to the subsequent bad conduct of the war, his father having retired from the command, and to the partial successes of the Hugonots in different parts of France, that peace was made in 1570. Of the peace he says, the Queen desired it, lest the Hugonots should be entirely crushed; the Guises consented to it, 'sous l'esperance d'attraper les Huguenots disarmez;' and Tavannes, tired of the fluctuations of the Court, 'ne s'y opposa pas.'§ Brantome may therefore be in the wrong in saying, that it was by counsel of Tavannes the peace was made; but it is clear, from the extract we have made, that he was not mistaken in attributing to that hoary veteran the advice, 'qu'il falloit venir par la voye du renard.'

It is well known, that the King called the peace of 1570 his own peace, and boasted that he made it in opposition to his mother and other counsellors, saying, he was tired of civil dissensions, and convinced from experience of the impossibility of reducing all his subjects to the same religion. It is also known, that, contrary to what had happened after former treaties, pains were taken on this occasion to observe the articles of pacification, and to punish those who infringed them;|| that the complaints of the Hugonots were listened to with attention, and their reasonable requests granted;¶ that their friends were in favour, and their enemies in apparent disgrace at Court; and

\* Tavannes, 374.

† Brantome, apud Castelnau, ii. 524.

‡ Brantome, apud Castelnau, iii. 3.

§ Tavannes, 358, 372.

|| Deserres, iv. 6, 7, 8.

¶ Thuan. iii. 67—d'Aubigné, 525.

that, in his conversations with Montmorenci, the King often spoke with praise and admiration of the Admiral.\* Repeated missions were sent to the Hugonot chiefs at Rochelle, with assurances of good will from the King; with proposals of marriage between his sister and the Prince of Bearn; and with projects of alliance with England and other Protestant powers, and of war with Spain, the great bulwark of the Catholic cause.† The deputies of the Hugonots, that went to Court on the affairs of their party, met with marked favour from the King, and some of them were admitted into his intimacy;‡ and when the Admiral was at length induced to repair to Blois, he was received with extraordinary respect and apparent affection, restored to all his honours and dignities, and loaded with benefits and marks of confidence. This apparent favour of the Admiral continued without interruption for many months. When absent from Court, the King maintained a correspondence with him by letters; and, in their private conversations, he affected to unbosom himself without reserve to his new friend, cautioned him against his mother and her Italian favourites, spoke disparagingly of his brother, and, in giving the characters of his Marshals, freely described their faults and censured their vices.§ The question at issue is, whether this conduct on the part of Charles was the result of deep dissimulation, or the expression of his real sentiments at the time.

Among the best informed and most judicious of the Italian historians, who wrote soon after the St Bartholomew, there is but one opinion on this point. We have already referred to the works of Capilupi and Adriani, both of whom were contemporaries of the massacre. Capilupi seems to have had his information from the persons most deeply connected with the contrivance and execution of this tragedy. Adriani had access to the papers of Cosmo, Grand Duke of Tuscany: and no doubt can be entertained, he assures us, that the massacre had been long premeditated, and that it was not produced by any sudden danger or necessity, as the Court pretended.|| In his account of the peace of 1570, Davila tells us, that the King, Queen-mother, Duke of Anjou, and Cardinal of Lorraine, determined to resume their old and often interrupted projects, to give peace to the Hugonots, to get the foreign armies out of France,—‘e poscia, con arte e con opportunita, opprimere i capi della fazione.’ He praises Charles, as above all things a most per-

\* Deserres, 12.

† Deserres, 13.

‡ Matthieu, 341.

§ Ibid. 19.

|| Adriani, Lib. xxii. 49.



fect master of simulation, and describes his whole conduct, from the peace to the St Bartholomew, as contrived to entrap the Hugonots, and entice them into the snares he had prepared for their destruction. \*

But laying aside, as some French authors are inclined to do, the opinions of Italian politicians, as being too refined in their speculations, and too loose in their principles to be worthy of credit, if we are to be guided by the best historians, and most distinguished critics among the French Catholics themselves, we shall find little doubt in pronouncing that the Court, and of course the King, was insincere in professions of amity to the Hugonots. Even Daniel is convinced, that the Queen would never have consented to the treaty of 1570, 'que dans l'esperance de faire tomber les chefs de la faction dans les pièges qu'elle leur preparoit.' † Pere Griffet, one of the best and most judicious of the French historical critics, is also of opinion, that the peace of 1570 was made for the sole purpose of enticing the chiefs of the Hugonots to Paris,—'dans la vue de les envelopper plus surement et plus aisément dans un mas-sacre général.' ‡ Le Laboureur, the diligent and intelligent commentator on Castelnau's *Memoirs*, speaking of the same peace, observes,—'Il n'y a point d'historien depouillé de passion, qui puisse écrire sans fiel l'infraction sanglante de cette paix, déjà concertée avant même que de la conclure.' § Mezeray considers the peace of 1570 as made for the purpose of entrapping the Hugonots;—'pour couper le Huguenotisme par le pied sans ebranler l'état,' it was necessary, he says, 'revenir au premier dessein de terminer la guerre par adresse, et d'envelopper les chefs dans les embûches.' || Matthieu, who lived still nearer the St Bartholomew, is equally convinced of the insincerity of the Court. After the peace of 1570, he tells us, the King, jealous of the continued residence of the Hugonot Chiefs at Rochelle, 'resolut de venger les offenses faites à son age, à sa religion et à sa couronne, et portant la cognée à la racine des divisions, en abattre les chefs. La prudence convertie en une grande dissimulation, et la resolution conduite par un grand secret, firent naître cette cruelle et furieuse journée des Matines de Paris.' ¶ De Thou alone, with his usual caution, hesitates to admit this long meditated treachery; and, if real, he is disposed to ascribe it to the Queen-mother, and to her secret Council, without the

\* Davila, i. 261–284.

† *Traité des Preuves*, 137.

|| Mezeray, ii. 1066.

† Daniel, x. 474.

§ Castelnau, ii. 767.

¶ Matthieu, 331.

knowledge of the King.\* Let us see whether there are not grounds for believing in the accusation that were unknown to De Thou.

While Cardinal d'Ossat was employed at Rome to solicit a divorce between Henry IV. and Margaret of Valois, he was told by Pope Clement VIII. (Aldrobandini), that when Cardinal Alessandrino, nephew of Pius V., was sent to the Court of France to prevent the marriage, Charles IX., in reply to his arguments, took him by the hand, and said to him,—‘*Mon-sieur le Cardinal, tout ce que vous me dites est bon, je le reconnois et en remercie la Pape et vous; et si j’avois quelque autre moyen de me venger de mes ennemis, je ne ferois point de ce mariage,—mais je n’en ai point d’autre que celui-ci.*’ His Holiness added, that, when the news of the St Bartholomew arrived at Rome, Cardinal Alessandrino exclaimed,—‘*Loué soit Dieu, le Roi de France m’a tenu promesse!*’ This anecdote was known to Pope Clement, because he was at that time auditor to Cardinal Alessandrino, and had accompanied him to France. He wrote down the story at the time, and was sure he could still find it in his own handwriting among Cardinal Alessandrino’s papers.† To this evidence, from authority so direct and unquestionable, passing through so few hands, and those of such high consideration, with no conceivable motive to pervert the truth, or to blacken the memory of Charles, we see no possible objection that can be made. It follows, that the King was sincere in his professions to the Hugonots, and that he made use of his sister’s marriage, as a covert to conceal, and an expedient to accomplish, his designs.

The same conversation is related by Capilapi, with slight variations in the details, but with an agreement in the main facts that corroborates the story; and with this addition, that after holding this discourse, the King took a valuable ring from his finger, and presented it to the Cardinal as a pledge of his attachment to the church. Alessandrino declined the ring, saying he desired nothing in addition to the King’s word, and went away satisfied with what had passed.‡ It is a confirmation of this part of the story, that Sir Thomas Smith, ambassador from England, who, with the Admiral and the other Hugonots, was completely deceived by the King’s profound dissimulation, wrote exultingly on the occasion to his friend Lord Burleigh—‘The foolish Cardinal went away as wise as he came; and the

---

\* Thuan. ii. 804.

† Lettres d'Ossat, 22d Sept. 1599, iii. 419. Ed. of 1732.

‡ Stratagemata, 1572.

‘ foolish part of all, at his going away, he refused a diamond which the King offered him of 600 crowns.’ \*

The same story is told by Catena in his *Life of Pius V.*; the conversation is related at greater length; and the declaration of the King made still more explicit. Catena had been long employed in the Papal service, and enjoyed the protection of Cardinal Alessandrino; but from the weakness of his judgment, and the violence of his bigotry, his work has had less credit with the French historians, than, from his opportunities of collecting information, it deserved. †

Cardinal Alessandrino was hardly gone from Court, when the Queen of Navarre arrived at Blois to conclude the marriage. The King received her with every demonstration of affection and cordiality; boasted to her that he had treated the monk, who came to break off the marriage, as his impudence deserved; ‡ and carried his duplicity so far as to say to her, ‘ Qu’il donnoit sa sceur, non pas au Prince de Navarre, mais à tous les Huguenots, pour se marier comme avec eux, et leur ôter toute doute de l’immuable fermeté de ses edits.’ §

It was after this interview with the Queen of Navarre, that Charles is, by some, reported to have said to his mother, ‘ Ne joue-je bien mon rollet, Madame?’—‘ Ce n’est pas fait,’ replied she; ‘ il faut achever.’—‘ Par la mort Dieu, Madame,’ answered he, ‘ je vous les mettrai tous au filé, si vous me voulez laisser faire.’ || But others relate the story differently, and postpone, till after the St Bartholomew, this vaunting of his dissimulation and perfection in playing his part. ¶ We are told, that after the massacre he complained, ‘ que ce que l’avoit le plus fâché, étoit d’être contraint à dissimuler si longuement.’ \*\*

The ardent thirst of vengeance which Charles avowed in his conversation with Alessandrino, was a part of his character which he was at no pains to conceal. He was often heard to declare, that he would never forgive the Hugonots for their attempt on his person at Meaux. †† He had been taught by his mother, that subjects who had once rebelled were never to be

\* Digges. 193.

† Catena, *vita del Papa Pio Quinto*, 130.—Mantoua, 1587.

‡ Deserres, iv. 17.

§ Matthieu, 336.

|| *Memoires de l’Etat*, l. 184.—*Journal de l’Estoile*, 72.—Sully, 13.—Thuan, 3. 115.—Matthieu, 348.

¶ Brantome, *apud Castlenau*, iii. 3.

\*\* MSS. Bibl. du Roi. 320. St Germ.

†† Matthieu, 340. Brantome.

trusted, that all means of vengeance were lawful, and that the surest were the best. \* His earliest biographer † admits, that he was impatient, passionate, false, and faithless, ‘*impatiens moræ*’ ‘*iracundia ferox, cum vellet egregius dissimulator, fidem violabat quoties ex usu videbatur.*’ Many stories are told of his sudden and furious bursts of passion; but when he chose, he was a master of dissimulation, and if necessary to his ends, no artifice or falsehood stood in his way. His education had been neglected by his mother, who desired to retain the conduct of affairs, and brought him forward on those occasions only when she wished to inspire terror by his furious passions. Active, or rather restless, from temperament, he was never tranquil for an instant, but was continually occupied with some violent exercise or other; and when he had nothing better to do, he would amuse himself with shoeing a horse, or working at a forge. ‡ Field sports were his delight; and the only ingenuity he ever displayed, was in planning and executing devices for ensnaring animals. He is even said to have composed a Treatise on the subject. But his pastimes were disfigured by cruelty. He appears to have had a physical gratification in shedding and imbruing his hands in blood; and when other victims were not at hand, he would try the sharpness of his sword on any domestic animal that came in his way. His courtiers applauded the liberality with which he made compensation to the owners for the slaughter committed in these sportive sallies, but were not themselves always exempt from such unexpected aggressions on their unoffending property. It was on an occasion of this sort that one of them exclaimed to him, ‘*Quid tibi dissidium cum mulo meo intercessit, rex Christianissime?*’ §

Under this childish and ferocious youth, his mother was the person who, in truth, governed the kingdom; and though jea-

\* Mezeray, 1070.

† Papire Masson.

‡ Such was his delight in this occupation, that he had a forge under his apartment in the Louvre, to which he daily repaired, ‘*se couvrant d’une socquenie de toile noire, par dessus ses habits; et bien souvent il travailloit en chemise, tant il estoit actif à son ouvrage.*’ \* The same historian who relates this fact, a contemporary, Parisian, and zealous Catholic, tells us, that the night before the St Bartholomew, the King went down to his forge, after supper, with the King of Navarre, the Prince of Condé, and other nobles, and, making them serve as assistants, set to work in his usual manner, as if he had nothing extraordinary on his mind.

§ Papire Masson—Brantôme—Le Laboureur.

\* Fayn. *Histoire de Navarre*, 867.

lous of her partiality to his brother, and occasionally rebellious to her authority, he was, in the end, subdued by her arts, and directed by her will. Catherine of Medicis must have been a woman of infinite address, for she seldom failed to overreach those whom it was her interest to deceive or gain over to her purposes. She must have been destitute of real wisdom, for she lost the confidence of all, and died miserable and broken-hearted. Clever and cunning, but short-sighted, skilful in getting out of a scrape, unscrupulous about the means she employed, utterly without principle, and regardless of truth, she attained her immediate objects, but left an indelible impression of the fraud and artifice of her character. Her reigning passion was the love of power; and to sow divisions among those whose rivalry she feared, was her instrument to acquire and to retain it. Jealousy of the House of Guise had made her cultivate and favour the Hugonots. The death of Francis Duke of Guise, relieving her from the apprehensions he had inspired, converted her into the most determined of their enemies. She had preferred Henry III. to all her children, and nursed him up as a sort of counterpoise to the King, his brother; \* but when the ungrateful son transferred to his minions the confidence and power, which she expected to be placed exclusively in her, she encouraged the League against him, which proved his ruin. † Her last exploit was to cajole and overreach Henry Duke of Guise, at Paris. Her last sigh was for his death—because no one was left to make her necessary to the son, for whom she had so recently tricked and deceived him.

Of her participation in the guilt of the St Bartholomew, no doubt is entertained even by those who attempt to vindicate the King. But it is an amusing trait of nationality, to observe the unanimity of the Italian historians, Capilupi, Adriani and Davila, in representing this atrocious act as the joint contrivance of the mother and son; while the French historians, who disapprove of the massacre, and even De Thou himself, try to exculpate the son, at the expense of the mother, and of her Italian confidants. They seem unwilling to admit, that a King of France could have been guilty of such treachery to his subjects; and, when forced to acknowledge that he was privy to the execution at least of the design, they endeavour to extenuate his offence, by pleading in excuse his youth and inexperience, and the bad education he had received.

That Catherine had long projected to ensnare and betray the Hugonots, and to take off their leaders by assassination, before

she was able to effectuate her purpose, no one can reasonably doubt, who reads the statements of Capilupi, published within a month of the St Bartholomew.

More than four years before the massacre, the Cardinal Santa Croce was instructed by her to assure Pope Pius the V., that she and her son had no object more at heart, 'che d'accogliere un giorno l'Ammiraglio e tutte i suoi sequaci insieme, e di farne un macello, ma che il negocio era cosi difficile che non si poteva promettere di farlo piu in un tempo che in un altro.' After the peace of 1570, the Pope being dissatisfied with the advantageous terms granted to the Hugonots, she wrote to him more letters than one (which were still to be seen, as Capilupi was informed by a person who had perused them), assuring him, 'che il re non intendeva in altra cosa piu che nell'estinguere coloro; ma che il modo e la forma non si poteva sapere, ne si doveva comunicare ad alcuno.' Capilupi adds, that at the time of the peace, only four persons besides the King were privy to the design; but that ten persons were let into the secret six months before its execution. In a conversation with Corero, the Venetian ambassador, who was expressing his pity for her situation, environed as she was by so many enemies, she replied that God would help her; and then told him a story of a former Queen-mother of France, surrounded by the same difficulties, who had, with feigned caresses, enticed her enemies to Paris, and cut off their heads; and then suddenly recollecting herself, she added, not that she would do, or intended to do the like, but she put her confidence in God.

The work containing these, and other facts and anecdotes of the same kind, was written at Rome within less than four weeks of the massacre, by a Catholic of distinction intimately connected with the sacred college; printed under the eyes of the Cardinal of Lorraine; and, though suppressed for a time, because the facts it disclosed were at variance with the story told by the Court of France, and circulated throughout Europe by its ambassadors, it was privately distributed at Rome, and afterwards published to all the world. The refinement in dissimulation which it attributes to the King and to the Queen-mother, may perhaps in some instances be carried too far, and some of the details it contains of what had recently passed in France, are erroneous; but, though republished with a French translation, and widely disseminated over Europe, we are not aware that any answer or refutation of it was ever attempted.

For some time before the massacre, reports were circulated among the Catholics, and suspicions were entertained by the

Hugonots, that some sinister project was in agitation. The Admiral was repeatedly warned of his danger, and admonished to be on his guard; but he was so completely won by the apparently frank demeanour of the King, that he rejected all these salutary cautions, saying, he had perfect reliance on the word of his Sovereign, and that he would rather perish by over-confidence, than, by distrust, involve his country once more in civil war. It was better, he said, to die at once, than to live in perpetual suspicion; ‘qu’il étoit saoul de telles alarmes, la longue durée de ses vieux ans n’avoit été que trop rompue de sem-  
blables frayeurs.’\* But, though the Admiral remained unshaken, many sayings were reported that gave alarm to the more cautious and timid of the Protestants. When the King of Navarre retired from church, before the commencement of the mass celebrated for his nuptials, some Catholics were heard to murmur, that ere long he would be compelled to go to mass against his will; and others prophesied, that more blood than wine would be spilt at the marriage-feast. † Hugonots at Paris were advertised, by their friends at a distance, that designs were entertained to their prejudice; ‡ but of all the warnings they received, the most remarkable was that given by Montluc, Bishop of Valence, to his friend La Rochefoucault. Montluc was not privy to the plot; but, from the instructions with which he was furnished for his embassy to Poland, he collected that no good was intended to the Hugonots; and before leaving Paris, he took La Rochefoucault aside, and advised him not to wait for the celebration of the marriage, but, as he valued his safety, to go home. La Rochefoucault, confiding like the Admiral in the apparent sincerity of the King, neglected the admonition, and perished with his friends. § Others were less credulous, and more fortunate. The story of Langoiran is well known, who left Paris before the massacre, as he told Coligny, ‘par ce qu’on vous fait trop de caresses, et que j’aime mieux me sauver avec les fous, que de perir avec les sages.’

Intercepted letters from the Cardinal de Pelvé to the Cardinal of Lorraine at Rome, made no greater impression on the Admiral than the exhortations and remonstrances of his friends, though these letters are said to have contained the plainest possible allusions to the treacherous designs of the Court. The King of Spain, it was said, had been apprised of their intentions, lest he should take umbrage at the enterprise on Flanders. The

---

\* La Popeliniere, ii. 63. Mem. de l’Etat i. 159. Thuan. Lib. 4. ii.

† Matthieu, 342—Deserres, iv. 28. ‡ Mezerey, 20.—Sully, i. 12.

§ Mem. de l’Etat, ii. 54—Thuan. lib. lii. liii.—Sully, i. 13.

marriage and pretended war were mentioned as necessary precludes to the execution of the plot. Whatever reports might reach him from France, the Cardinal of Lorraine was desired to be in no alarm, and to rest assured that at no time were the King, Queen, and Duke of Anjou, better disposed than at present to carry into execution the resolutions of their secret council. These letters were shown to Coligny, but were disregarded by him as artifices of the Catholic party to frustrate his designs on Flanders, by inspiring him with distrust, and embroiling him with the King.\*

In opposition to these proofs of a preconcerted plot, it is alleged on the other side, that when the Hugonots were invited to Paris, there was no intention of the massacre that followed; and that they drew that calamity on themselves by the pertinacity with which they urged the King to a war with Spain, by the insidious attempts of the Admiral to prejudice Charles against his mother and brother, and by the indecent threats and insolent language of his friends after he was wounded, which left the Court no alternative but to choose between a massacre and a civil war.

Such are the attempts made in later times to excuse or palliate the massacre; but when it was still recent, a different story was told and circulated in every part of Europe. It was said in official letters from the Court, that the Admiral, and those who perished with him, had conspired to surprise the Louvre, and murder the King and all the Royal family, the Prince of Condé excepted; that the plot was revealed to the Council, the evening before it was to have been carried into execution, by some repentant conspirators, struck with horror at the treasonable designs of their associates; that in the hurry and alarm excited by this information, orders were given to put the Admiral and his principal accomplices to death; and that the indiscriminate slaughter that followed, was the work of an infuriated mob, whose ancient hatred of the Hugonots was exasperated by this recent discovery of their perfidy. But this tale, which was not invented till two days after the St Bartholomew, carries improbability on the face of it. That some hundreds of gentlemen, with no force to support them but their own servants, should dream of such an enterprise in the heart of Paris, a city armed and devoted to their enemies, in the face of 1200 harquebuziers, besides the King's ordinary guard, with their chief disabled by his wounds, and themselves dispersed in different quarters of the town, may be pronounced a charge utterly in-

---

\* *Mem. de l'Etat.* 1. 158.—Sully, 1. 13.



credible; and, if necessary, it is sufficiently refuted by the fact, that, instead of being armed and prepared for action, these pretended conspirators were mostly slaughtered in their beds.

If the Hugonots had intended to murder the King and Royal Family, what hindered them from executing their design when Charles, attended by his mother, his brothers, and some of his courtiers, visited the Admiral in the evening after the attempt on his life? The King was then unaccompanied by his guards, and more than sixty armed Hugonots were in the house. Why should they have postponed their enterprise, if they had such a design in contemplation? What better opportunity could they expect? The King was in their hands without the means of resistance. They had been apprised of his coming, and had time for consultation. Why prefer an uncertain attempt on the Louvre to the immediate execution of their purpose? They had not only the King and Royal family in their power, but their chief enemies among the Catholics. Tavannes, Montpensier, Nevers, de Retz and others, who, thirty-six hours later, were riding through the streets of Paris, calling out to the populace to leave no Hugonot alive, were at that moment at their mercy. What better proof can be given of their reliance on the King's protection, than their suffering such an opportunity to escape of avenging their leader, and exterminating their enemies? The Queen-mother and the Duke of Anjou afterwards confessed to one another, that they had never passed such unpleasant moments as on that occasion, when surrounded and without defence in the midst of their enemies. But it was the consciousness of guilt that made them pale. They knew that, though the Guises were suspected of the crime, they were the persons who had employed the assassin against the Admiral. The Hugonots had no suspicion of the fact; and trusted to the justice of the King for reparation of the injury they had sustained.

But, to place in the clearest and most unexceptionable light the falsehood of this accusation, we shall briefly state the different and inconsistent accounts of the massacre put forth by authority from the Court.

After the attempt to murder the Admiral on the 22d of August, the King sent letters to all his governors and chief officers in France, and to his ambassadors in foreign courts, informing them of the event, expressing his regret at the crime, and promising 'bonne, briefve et rigoureuse justice de cet act pernicious.' \*

---

\* Mem. de l'Etat. t. 202.—D'Aubigné, 539.—Letter to Schomberg, MSS. Bibl. du Roi, 8684. Bethune.

On the evening after the St Bartholomew, he sent other letters to the same persons, relating, and affecting to bewail the massacre that had taken place, but imputing it entirely to the private dissensions between the houses of Guise and Chatillon, rekindled, as he pretends, by the recent attempt on the Admiral's life, which his friends imputed to the Guises, and had threatened to avenge upon them, adding, falsely, that the guards he had placed for the protection of the Admiral had been forced, when, in fact, they were the persons employed in the murder; and insinuating, with equal disregard of truth, that during this sedition, as he calls it, he had been himself in danger within the Louvre.\*

On the following day, he wrote to Schomberg, his agent with the Protestant Princes of Germany, that having been apprised by some of the Hugonots themselves of a conspiracy entered into by the Admiral and his friends to murder him, his mother and his brothers, he had been forced, 'pour se garantir d'un danger qui lui étoit tout certain; de lâcher la main a MM. de la Maison de Guise,' who had, in consequence, slain the Admiral and some other gentlemen of his party; since which, the populace, exasperated by the report of the conspiracy, and irritated to see the Royal Family constrained 'de se reserrer dedans le chateau du Louvre avec leurs gardes, et de tenir les portes fermées, pour s'assurer contre la force et violence qu'on lui vouloit faire,' had been guilty of violent excesses, and, to his great regret, had killed all the chiefs of the Hugonots that were at Paris.†

At length, on the 26th of August, the King went in state to the Parliament of Paris, and owned himself the author of the massacre, declaring that what had taken place had been done by his express command, and at the same time accusing the Admiral and his adherents of a plot to murder all the Royal Family, the King of Navarre included.‡ Circulars, containing this new edition of the story, were distributed on the 28th.

Other letters had, in the mean time, been addressed to the Swiss Cantons, which, without naming the authors of the massacre, impute that crime, as it is justly called, to the persons who had some days before attempted the Admiral's life, and who, it is supposed, have had recourse to this violence, to escape the punishment due for their former misdeed. Great re-

\* Mem. de l'Etat, l. 213-216.—Caveyrac, xxxii.—Letter to M. de Ferrals at Rome. MSS. Bib. du Roi, Desmemes, Reg. 8677-3.

† Letter to Schomberg—MS. Bibl. du Roi, 8684, Bethunc.

‡ Thuan, iii. 139—Mem. de l'Etat, l. 232.

gret is expressed for this accident, as it is called; and those to whom the letter is addressed, are assured, that during the continuance of the sedition, which is said to be now happily appeased, the King had enough to do, with all his guards, to maintain himself within his palace of the Louvre. In conclusion, the Swiss are desired to believe, that this accident has arisen entirely out of a private quarrel, and not from any intention to infringe the Edict of Pacification, which the King is determined on no account to violate. \*

It appears, from a MS. in the Royal library at Paris, that another and a still different version of the story had been at one time in contemplation. The paper to which we allude, is entitled, ‘*Epistola Caroli IX. Galliae regis, de Catilinaria Admiralii ac sociorum in regium sanguinem conspiratione, eoque scelere punito, scripta Galliae regis manu, ad præcipuos quosdam imperii principes, anno 1572.*’† It professes to be a justification of the King from the calumnious reports circulated against him on account of the St Bartholomew. It makes him take God to witness, that so far from having settled the massacre before hand, he had made no preparations for it, or entertained thoughts of it till the day before it happened. It then gives the substance of a pretended harangue from the Admiral to his principal associates, in which he exhorts them, as they value their safety, to anticipate the designs of their enemies, by surprising the Louvre, putting to death or imprisoning the King and the Royal Family, and placing the King of Navarre on the throne of France; and it represents him, after fixing a day for the enterprise, and assigning to the different chiefs the parts they were to act, as exacting from them an oath that they would execute the design he had proposed. The King of Navarre, it is pretended, shocked at this traitorous and murderous plot, revealed it to his wife, and desired her to communicate the information to her mother. Charles, thus apprised of the conspiracy, sent for the King of Navarre and Prince of Condé, who confessed the whole, and solicited and obtained his forgiveness. It is probable that this letter was not sent to the German princes for whom it was written, as no mention is made of it by historians; and from the character of the King of Navarre, it may be conjectured, that the reason for suppressing it was the refusal of that prince to lend his name to so vile a calumny. In the subsequent editions of the story, he was included in the list of intended victims, and the Prince of Condé

---

\* Mem. de l'Etat, l. 230.

† MS. Bibl. du Roi, 333—Dupuy.

selected as the person for whom the crown of France was destined by the conspirators.

The contradictions and variations in these accounts, are of themselves sufficient to destroy all confidence in the allegations of the Court. If the Hugonots had conspired against the King, and if the detection of their plot had forced him to proceed to such extremities against them, why, in his letters of the 24th, did he make no allusion to the treason for which they had suffered? Why, in his letters of the same date, did he lament the murder of his cousin the Admiral, and the excesses that followed, without saying a word of the guilt which had provoked that execution, or of the criminal designs which it prevented? Why did he impute to private vengeance, what he afterwards acknowledged to have been done by his own orders? Why insinuate that his guards had made resistance, in defence of the Admiral, or assert that, during the tumult, he had been compelled, for his safety, to shut himself up within the Louvre? The truth is, that, when the letters of the 24th were written, the Court intended to disavow the massacre, and to throw the whole blame of it on the House of Guise. But the Guises having refused to take on themselves the guilt of so execrable an act, the King was forced to acknowledge the truth, and own it had been perpetrated by his orders. It then became necessary to invent some excuse for a proceeding so sanguinary and perfidious; or, in the plain language of Tavannes, ‘*d’inventer une troisieme mensonge;*’\* and none better occurred than a pretended plot of the Hugonots, revealed to the Council the day before it was to have been carried into execution.

When we look more narrowly into these letters, we find in every one of them the grossest mis-statements and perversions of truth. In that to Schomberg, for instance, of the 25th of August, we are told, that De Piles and Monneins, gentlemen attached to the King of Navarre, had secreted themselves in the Louvre on the night of the massacre,—‘*pour aider à ceux qui devoient venir de dehors en plus grand nombre, à forcer les portes du dit chateau, leur entreprise, ce qui fut decouvert du grand matin, et les dits gentilshommes dechassés du dit chateau.*’ The truth is, that the King of Navarre, by the particular desire of Charles, had assembled about his person some of his officers, ‘*pour se garder des desseins du Duc de Guise, qu’il disoit (le Roi) être un mauvais garçon;*’ and these gentlemen, instead of being merely turned out of the palace, were, next morning, butchered in cold

---

\* Tavannes, 419.

blood at the gate of the Louvre, within sight of the King, orders for that execution having been given the preceding evening to the captain of the guards. \* De Mergey, in the very interesting account he has left of his own escape, relates, that, in quitting the palace late at night with the Count de la Rochefoucault, one of his old comrades, who was at the gate, took an affectionate and melancholy leave of him,—‘ Ne m’osant  
‘ lors dire ce qui m’a bien dit depuis, car il savoit bien l’execution qui se devoit faire, mais il n’y alloit que de sa vie s’il en  
‘ eut rien decelé.’

After attempting, in the first instance, to disguise the truth, Charles was induced, by several reasons, to own himself the author of the massacre. The Guises not only refused to incur the odium of so foul and detestable a deed, but to convince the world, that the part they had taken in the carnage proceeded from their ancient hatred to the Admiral, and not from enmity to those of his religion, they spared the lives of several Hugonots; and when ordered to leave Paris after the affair was over, they refused to go, lest their departure should give a colour to the imputations cast upon them. On the other hand, letters were found on Teligny, written by Montmorency, after the attempt on the Admiral on the 22d, in which that nobleman, supposing it to have been made by the Guises, threatened exemplary vengeance for so vile and treacherous an act. To prevent the mischiefs of a fresh quarrel between these two powerful houses, and that he might not appear to have been a helpless spectator in his palace of the disorders committed in his capital, Charles was advised to confess the truth, and to own he had given orders for the massacre. †

To the Pope, says a Hugonot writer, he pretended that his object in this irregular and sanguinary proceeding was to reduce France to one religion; to the German Princes he protested, that it was solely to punish his rebellious subjects. His earnestness to justify himself in the eyes of the Protestant Princes of Germany, arose from his desire to procure for his brother Henry the Crown of Poland, which, without their concurrence, he had no hope to accomplish. In that point he succeeded, because they were more afraid of an Austrian than of a French King in Poland. In satisfying them about the St Bartholomew, he appears to have failed entirely. But with the Queen of England, it seems, he was more successful. ‘ The insinuating lan-

---

\* Mem. de l’Etat. i. 206–209—Deserres, iv. 34–38—Thuan. iii. 123—Tavannes, 418—De Mergey, 21.

† Mem. de l’Etat, i. 228—Thuan. iii. 139.

'guage of Fenelon,' (French Ambassador at London,) says Dr Lingard, \* 'made an impression on the mind of Elizabeth.' But of what sort was that impression, and by what means was it produced? From the instructions of her Privy Council to Walsingham, (9th September), and from the private letters of Burleigh and Leicester to that ambassador, it appears that, by the solemn asseverations and outward show of grief on the part of Fenelon, she was inclined to believe that Charles 'was not guilty of the murther, otherwise than 'as his ambassador reported;' that is, not as 'the author' and deviser of the massacre, but, 'by sudden fear and practice, brought' to consent to it. 'The ambassador,' says Leicester, (11th September), 'hath inwardly dealt with me, and 'would have me believe that we shall shortly see that the matter is not the King's, and that he doth detest it so much as he 'will make revenge of it. God grant it be so, but you may 'easily understand it; and surely you shall do well inwardly, 'as her Majesty hath written unto you (but warily) to discover 'it, even with himself; and if it may appear he stands in any 'fear of his person, or doubts his force to assist him, I know 'her Majesty will venture twenty thousand of her best subjects 'for him and with him in so good a quarrel.' It is plain from these extracts, that Elizabeth had been led, by Fenelon's representations, to believe that Charles had been an unwilling instrument in the massacre, and that he was desirous, but unable, to bring to justice the devisers of so horrid a deed. But these delusions were dissipated by the first despatches she received from Walsingham, who assured the Council, that by the King's language, as well as by his subsequent conduct, it was but too apparent that the massacre 'proceeded of himself, 'though her Majesty was otherwise informed by the ambassador.'† The insinuating eloquence of Fenelon consisted, therefore, in a misrepresentation of facts; and the impression on the mind of Elizabeth lasted no longer than the return of a messenger from Walsingham.

There were two powerful reasons that made the Court of France conceal its real motives, and disguise its conduct in the St Bartholomew. The King was desirous to prevent the Hugonots, who had escaped the massacre, from taking up arms in the provinces where they were numerous, till he had introduced garrisons into the principal towns inhabited by their party. He was therefore in haste to assure them, that the slaughter of their friends at Paris was unconnected with religion, and at

---

\* Mem. de l'Etat, viii. 1.

† Digges, 246—258.

pains to profess his determination to maintain inviolate his edict of pacification. He was also anxious, as we have already remarked, to obtain for his brother the crown of Poland; and as the Protestants in that kingdom were a numerous and powerful body, it became necessary to quiet their apprehensions, and to convince them, by his ambassadors sent to their diets, and indirectly through the other Protestant states, that it was owing to a conspiracy against his person, and not to hatred of the religion they professed, that, contrary to the faith of treaties and obligations of hospitality, he had sacrificed so many thousands of his subjects. Had it not been for these reasons, it is probable that he would have openly avowed what he had done, and gloried in the act; and, such was the bigotry of the age, that instead of incurring the detestation he deserved, what passed at Rome must convince every impartial mind, that he would have been applauded for his conduct by every Catholic Government in Europe.

But it is said, that if there were no proofs of a conspiracy before the massacre, there was ample evidence of it afforded by the secret papers of the Admiral, discovered after his death. To this it is sufficient to reply, that his Diary, containing a minute account of his most private transactions, after having been examined by the Queen-mother, was suppressed by her orders; and that Morvilliers, to whom his papers were consigned, withheld many pieces, which, by justifying him, would have done harm to the King and Queen.\* After such fraudulent conduct, no credence is due to what his enemies pretend to have found in his papers. But, after all, what discovery of his criminal projects have they extracted from them? They tell us that the Hugonots had a common fund, raised by assessment on all the members of their party, collected by regular officers, and paid into a general treasury, from which the Admiral received a monthly pension;—that they had lists of their adherents throughout France, with chiefs appointed to govern and direct them in every province;—that Coligny had a guard for his person;—and that a muster-roll of officers and soldiers belonging to the party was found in his pocket-book.† But, if the Hugonots levied a contribution from all persons connected with their religion, it was with the knowledge and consent of the King, partly to defray their common expenses, and partly to discharge their debt to the Reiters and Landskenets, who had served with them during the war. Charles himself

---

\* *Le Laboureur*—Castelnau, l. 501.—*Thuan.* iii. 144.

† *Tavannes*, 419.—*Bellievre*, apud *Villeroy*, iv. 338.

had advanced money for that purpose; and when the massacre of Paris took place, the account was not finally liquidated.\* If Coligny received a small pension from the common treasury of his party, it was to defray his journeys and messages in the lawful management of their affairs. He had exhausted an ample fortune in their service, and died loaded with debt. If he had a guard for his person, it was by desire of the King, to secure him from the enmity of the Guises. If he had lists of officers and men ready for service, they were formed by directions of the King for the war in Flanders. If the Hugonots maintained their internal organization throughout France, it was the natural result of the distrust produced by the violation of so many former treaties. The true and only effectual remedy for their suspicions was the maintenance of the Edict of Pacification.

It is next alleged, that the pertinacity with which the Admiral insisted on war with Spain, and the menacing and insolent language he used to the King when urging that measure, exasperated Charles and his Catholic counsellors, and left them no alternative, if they refused to embark in that project, but a massacre of the Hugonots at Paris, or a renewal of civil war in France. In attempting to excuse the St Bartholomew, the French ambassador, Bellievre, assures the Swiss, that when the King hesitated about the Spanish war and invasion of Flanders, the Admiral 'n'eut point de honte de lui dire en plein conseil, 'et avec une incroyable arrogance, que si sa Majesté ne vouloit 'consentir de faire la guerre en Flandre, elle se pouvoit assurer 'de l'avoir bientôt en France, entre ses sujets. Il n'y a pas 'deux mois que, se ressouvenant sa Majesté d'une telle arrogance, disoit à aucuns siens serviteurs, entre lesquels j'étois, 'que quand il se voyoit ainsi menacé, les cheveux lui dressaient 'en la tête. Je ne parle point seulement par rapport d'autrui. 'Je l'ai vu, je l'ai oui, j'ai été présent, j'en ai eu plusieurs fois 'horreur.'† In the same spirit, the King is made to say, in a letter to Schomberg (13th September), after recapitulating the offences he had received from the Admiral, 'Il m'a été 'impossible de le supporter plus longuement.'‡ Similar stories are told, and a similar explanation given of the St Bartholomew by the Viscount de Tavannes.

It is, in the first place, to be remarked, that this account of the hostile disposition of Charles towards the Admiral before the

---

\* Thuan. iii. 61.—Descrèes, iv. 9. 29.—Sully, 1. 7.

† Mem. de Villeray, iv. 321.

‡ MSS. Bibl. du Roi, 996, St Germ.

vql. XLIV. NO. 87.



massacre, is inconsistent with the story of his brother, the Duke of Anjou, and of his sister Margaret, both of whom represent him to the last moment attached to Coligny, captivated with his plans and conversation, and unwillingly brought to consent to his murder; and, in the second place, the whole statement turns on a gross misrepresentation of what passed about the Spanish war. The first suggestion of a war with Spain in the Low Countries came from the King.\* Marshals Cossé and Biron were sent with that proposition to the Admiral, who listened to it at first with distrust, and was not convinced of the sincerity of the proposal till many messages and negotiations had intervened. It was not till the King, in his secret interviews with Teligny, La Noue, and Prince Louis of Nassau, had persuaded them he was in earnest, that Coligny could be induced to quit Rochelle, and repair to Court.† He had subsequently many private consultations with the King on this enterprise, besides the public discussions that took place in Council. The King seemed to enter heartily into his views—talked of him as the person destined to be commander-in-chief of the expedition—urged him, when absent, to return to Court, as the business of Flanders could not go on without him—consulted him about the officers to be employed—advanced money from his treasury, and gunpowder from his arsenal, for the attempt on Mons and Valenciennes—and permitted the troops levied in France, in support of the Flemish insurgents, to march openly through his towns, with arms and banners displayed.‡ What are called the threats of the Admiral, were the arguments he used against the Catholic counsellors, who were averse to the undertaking, and exaggerated its difficulties. He contended, that, after so many years of civil war, it was necessary to employ in foreign service those who had been so long habituated to the license of arms, and that nothing would tend more effectually to allay the rancour of religious animosities in France, than to occupy both parties in a national war.§ When objections were made, he offered to levy 10,000 men for the expedition, || not as an insolent bravado, but to convince the King, that, if he embarked in the enterprise, he might depend on the hearty concurrence of one part at least of his subjects. And so far was Charles from viewing his offer in the light

\* Mem. de l'Etat, i. 4—Deserres iv. 13.—Matthieu, 331—Davila i. 265.—Sully 1. 2. 7. 8.

† Mem. de l'Etat, 176. 179—Deserres, iv. 18. 22—Sully i. 8.

‡ Varamund. 23. 24—MMS. B.bl. du Roi, 324 St Germ.

§ Matthieu, 338.

|| Tavannes, 411.

in which it is presented by Tavannes, that he expressed his satisfaction at the intelligence, and requested a list of the principal gentlemen who would undertake the levy, with the intention, says Capilupi, of including them in the massacre, but, as Coligny understood, of employing them in the war. \*

That Tavannes, Nevers, Morvilliers, and other Catholics in the Council, were alarmed at the prospect of a Spanish war, and foresaw that, if successful, it must strengthen the Hugonot interest at court, is most certain. The numerous and urgent memorials they presented on the subject, afford the strongest proof of the reality and sincerity of their fears. But if the language and conduct of the Admiral in council had been such, as to disgust and offend the King, what ground had they for these apprehensions? Could the Admiral have declared war on Spain against the opinion of the King, and majority of the Council? They feared, and perhaps with truth, that Charles, instead of being irritated or provoked by the warmth of Coligny, was dazzled by the prospects of conquest and victory presented to his imagination, and inclined to enter heartily into the war. Even the misfortune of Genlis, who was surprised and defeated by the Spaniards, as he advanced to the relief of Mons, made no apparent impression on his mind. Instead of being discouraged by this reverse, he directed money to be advanced from his treasury to the Admiral, for the equipment of a new force under Villars, to repair the loss. That it had a different effect on the Queen-mother, is not improbable; nor is it at all impossible, that this inauspicious commencement of the campaign, joined with her jealousy of the influence Coligny seemed to be acquiring over her son, whom she had educated in such habits of dissimulation that she could place no confidence in his sincerity, hastened the execution of the massacre. †

No one has denied more positively than the Viscount de Tavannes the existence of a long premeditated project of the St Bartholomew. ‡ According to him, the massacre was occasioned by the fears and jealousy of the Queen-mother; § by the injudicious attempts of the Admiral to excite dissensions in the Royal Family; || by the pertinacity of the Hugonots in demanding war with Spain, and urging alliances with England

---

\* Mem. de l'Etat, i. 176.

† Mem. de l'Etat, i. 180. 193.—Tavannes, 413.

‡ Tavannes, 372, 376, 377, 402, 412, 413, 417, 419, 439, 450.

§ Ib. 415, 416.

|| Ib. 376, 415.

and the Protestant States of Germany; \* by their menacing and insolent language after the first attempt on the Admiral, † and by their suspicions that the Duke of Anjou was concerned in that affair. ‡ But Tavannes was anxious to exculpate his father from the imputation of having been the deviser of a measure held in execration by all mankind; and from the mistakes into which he has fallen, it is clear, that he was very imperfectly acquainted with the machinations that preceded the massacre. He makes the attempt on the Admiral's life to have been contrived by the Queen-mother, and Duke of Anjou, with two other counsellors, of whom his father was one; § but the Duke of Anjou tells us, that no one was concerned in it except himself, his mother, and the Dutchess of Nemours. He tells us it was the Duke of Aumale who found a convenient station for the assassin; || the Duke of Anjou gives that office to the Dutchess of Nemours. He ascribes to the advice of Coligny the plan of sending the Duke of Anjou to Poland, ¶ a project originally conceived by the Queen-mother, and pursued with the greatest earnestness after the massacre. In the debates that preceded the St Bartholomew, he describes the Marshal de Retz as recommending a general massacre, not only of the Hugonot chiefs, but of the Montmorencies; and represents his father as combating that opinion, and saving, by his firmness and moderation, the King of Navarre and Prince of Condé.\*\* The Duke of Anjou, on the contrary, makes de Retz the only person in the Council who opposed the massacre; and the account he gives of that nobleman's conduct on the occasion, is confirmed with many plausible arguments by Le Laboureur, who accuses Tavannes of disguising the truth, 'pour rejeter sur lui (de Retz) ce qu'on doit attribuer aux autres.' ††

The two Gaspards, Coligny, and Tavannes, were not merely political rivals, but personal enemies. When they entered Paris together in company with the King, the spectators, says the son of Tavannes, asked one another, 'à qui tromperoit son compagnon. ‡‡ A quarrel that followed between them may be considered either as evidence of a design already formed to assassinate Coligny, or as an incident that contributed to that event. High words having passed between them, in which the Admiral had not spared his opponent, a gentleman present, who knew the fiery temper of Tavannes, expressed to him afterwards his surprise at the forbearance he had shown in

\* Tavannes, 372, 376, 415, 419.

† Ib. 417, 418. ‡ Ib. 417, *La Popeliniere*, ii. 64. § Ib. 416.

|| Ib. ib. ¶ Ib. 415.

\*\* Ib. 417, 418, 421.

†† Castelnau, ii. 28.

‡‡ Tavannes, 379.

tolerating so public an affront in presence of the Court; in reply to which, 'il lui echappa de dire, qu'il en vouloit avoir une vengeance encore plus publique, et en peu de jours.' \* The son of Tavannes gives a different version of the story. He tells us, that the Admiral seeking a quarrel with his father, to have a pretext for killing him in a fray, took occasion to say to him in public, that the man who opposed a war with Spain was no good Frenchman, and had a red cross at his heart. Tavannes, seeing his opponent attended by a numerous body of friends, took advantage of his deafness, and made no reply; but said afterwards to one of his followers, 'un jeune homme s'y fut perdue ils ne m'y tiendront plus.' This affair, however, says the son, made his father doubly the enemy of Coligny, and added fears for his own life to his other motives for getting rid of his rival. †

That the threats and intemperate language of the Hugonots, after the Admiral was wounded, may have determined the moment, and accelerated the orders for the massacre, is not improbable. The violence of de Piles and Pardaillan, if not exaggerated by the apologists of the Court, was calculated to offend the pride of the King, who was jealous of his dignity, and to alarm the fears of the Queen-mother, who was conscious of her guilt. But that so extensive and barbarous an execution, if it had not been previously in contemplation, could have proceeded from so slight a cause, it is impossible to believe. Whispers, it is said, were heard among the Hugonots, accusing the Queen and Duke of Anjou of some knowledge or concern in the assassination; but it was against the Guises, who were publicly charged with the attempt, that they invoked the justice of their Sovereign, and no one suspected him of any participation in the guilt. Their demands of justice were loud, because they believed the King sincere in his professions of regret for the crime, and of indignation against the criminals. Their conduct to the last moment shows they had reliance on the King's word, and confidence in his protection.

But it is much more probable that the execution of the massacre was hastened, by the information received from a Hugonot of the name of Bouchavannes, that the Vidame de Chartres had twice proposed to his party to leave Paris in a body, and to carry away the Admiral in their ranks.‡ If this suggestion had not been overruled by Teligny, and objected to by the Admiral himself, it is probable that the greater

---

\* Le Lebourneur, apud Castelnau, ii. 530. † Tavannes, 437.

‡ Thuan.

part of the Hugonot gentlemen would have escaped; for, being well armed and mounted, when once out of Paris, they would have had nothing to fear from any force that could have been collected against them on a sudden. Apprehensions, that if this proposal was renewed a third time it might be adopted, and that enemies collected with such art and patience might, by delay, escape from the toils prepared for them, will explain why a massacre so long projected was at last hurried on with so few precautions to direct its course or to restrain its fury, and why an execution planned and conducted by the Government, exhibited in its details all the confusion and disorder of a popular commotion.

One difficulty still remains. If the Court intended from the first a general massacre of the Hugonot chiefs, why attack the Admiral without the others? If the first attempt on Coligny had been successful, is it not probable that his friends would instantly have left Paris, and, consulting their safety in flight, have withdrawn themselves from the fury of their enemies?

Various solutions have been attempted of this difficulty.

It has been supposed by some, that the great object of the Court was the destruction of the Admiral, 'croyant tout le parti Huguenot consister en sa tête,' and provided he was disposed of, that the fate of his adherents was of secondary importance. This must have been the view of Francourt, Chancellor of Navarre, if it be true, as related by Tavannes, that among the Admiral's papers was found an admonitory letter from Francourt, foretelling exactly all that happened, that Coligny would be the first victim, and, if the attempt on him failed, that it would be followed by a general massacre of the party.\* But, if the death of the Admiral had been the sole or chief object of the previous machinations of the Court, why defer it so long after his arrival at Paris? Why neglect the many opportunities that must have offered to assassinate him with certainty and ease? Why resort to the bungling expedient of hiring a man to shoot at him from a window as he was walking in the street, when he was every morning at the Louvre, in private conversation with the King, or unattended by his friends at the Council Board? Why attempt that secretly and by stealth, which might have been accomplished openly and by authority? And lastly, when the intended assassination had failed, why not employ the guards stationed round his lodging to murder him, without including his followers in the massacre?

---

\* Tavannes, 419. 127.

Others, judging from the unprincipled policy and plotting character of Catherine, have pretended, that it was her object, in this attempt, to extinguish, by one stroke, the rival houses of Guise and Chatillon, both equally obnoxious to her, and competitors with her for power; that she directed the assassination of the Admiral, in the expectation that his friends, attributing the crime to the Guises, and confiding in the favour of the King, would take justice into their own hands, and, attacking the Duke of Guise in his hotel, afford the Court an opportunity to get rid of both factions at once. But this hypothesis, though adopted by Davila, seems too refined and uncertain a speculation even for the Queen-mother to have acted on. If the Admiral had been killed, it is infinitely more probable that his friends would have quitted Paris in dismay, and sought refuge in the provinces attached to their party. It must be observed, however, that when Coligny was wounded, some of his hot-headed adherents did propose to take immediate vengeance on the Guises, without waiting for the slow course of justice. But the Admiral forbade the attempt, saying, he put his confidence in the King. \*

One other conjecture remains, that the King, though originally a party in the conspiracy, had vacillated before the moment arrived for its execution; that the Queen-mother, alarmed at the apparent progress Coligny was making in the confidence of her son, contrived the attempt on his life in the manner described by the Duke of Anjou, and, having failed in the enterprise, that partly by fear, and partly by insinuation, she brought back the King to his original design of despatching the Admiral and other Hugonot chiefs, and making such a slaughter of the party as to disable them from any future resistance to his will.

To judge of the probability of this conjecture, we must take into consideration the character of Charles and the dissensions that had prevailed for some years in his Court.

The King had been long envious of his brother's reputation, jealous of his influence, and suspicious of the preference shown to him by their mother. These sentiments, originally inspired by the Cardinal of Lorraine, sometimes showed themselves in coldness and estrangement to his brother, sometimes in abuse of his character and ridicule of his manners, and sometimes they broke out with a degree of violence that alarmed the

---

\* MSS. Bibl. du Roi, 324. St Germ. p. 116. 147.

Queen-mother, and overset all her plans. \* The victories of Jarnac and Montcontour, which were really owing to the military talents of Tavannes, had thrown a false glare around the Duke of Anjou, and made him at once the idol of the Catholics, and the terror and aversion of the Protestants; and these prepossessions the young Prince had studiously encouraged, by affecting an inordinate zeal and devotion to the Catholic Church, and an equal contempt and detestation of the Hugonots. Charles, finding his brother the favourite hero of his Catholic subjects, became less disinclined to the Hugonots, dismissed from his memory their former transgressions, and sought, in their confidence and attachment, a counterpoise to the favour enjoyed by his brother among the Catholics. The war in Flanders, which he had probably at first employed as a bait to entice the Admiral to Court, when narrowly examined and recommended by the arguments and eloquence of Coligny, flattered the passion he was willing to indulge for military glory, and opened prospects to his ambition of extending and enlarging his dominions. He was besides pleased, or affected to be pleased, with the conversation of some of the Hugonot chiefs, and expressed his admiration of the military talents of others. How far these sentiments were genuine, or to what extent they were feigned, it is impossible to decide. Coligny trusted to their influence, and fell a sacrifice to his credulity. He did not calculate enough on the levity and instability of Charles, nor take sufficiently into account his habitual deference and submission to his mother. He forgot how easy it was to rekindle in a proud and ferocious character like the King's, his ancient hatred and projects of vengeance against the Hugonots; and how difficult to penetrate the secret workings of a mind habituated to perfidy and dissimulation from his childhood. To the remonstrances of his friends he replied, that he put his trust in the word of his Sovereign, and that he would rather perish, and be dragged in a hurdle along the streets of Paris, than involve his country again in civil war. Nor did even the attempt on his life divert him from this forbearance and moderation. So far from devising plans for fresh wars and disturbances, as alleged by his enemies, he directed letters to be written on the 23d to his adherents throughout France, informing them that his wounds were not mortal, urging them to remain quiet, and assuring them that the King would do him justice. †

---

\* Tavannes, 358, 359, 377.—Brantome, apud Castelnau, iii. 2.—*La Laboureur*, apud Castelnau, iii. 32.—*Deserres*, iv. 6, 7.

† *Deserres*, iv. 32.

To the last moment his confidence in the King was unabated. When the tumult at the gate of his hotel, on the morning of the St Bartholomew, awoke his attendants, he desired them to be tranquil, as it was only a popular commotion excited by the Guises, which the guards would reduce to order. \*

By this supposition, of some change or vacillation in Charles before the massacre, we are enabled to reconcile the accounts of Margaret, and of the Duke of Anjou, with the incontestable proofs of a premeditated plot to entrap and destroy the Hugonots. Both these personages concur in saying, that, at the last moment, the King was brought with difficulty to consent to the murder of the Admiral; and as their accounts were drawn up without communication, their agreement on that point is a confirmation of its truth. Margaret was not intrusted with the plot, and was left in ignorance of the intended massacre till it had actually commenced. She relates, that on the eve of the St Bartholomew, as she was about to retire to her husband's apartment, her sister of Lorraine, who was in the secret, burst into tears on taking leave of her for the night, for which she was sternly reprimanded by their mother, who ordered her to be silent, and to let her sister go. Margaret's story of the reasons that led to the massacre, is not therefore to be depended on, supposing her disposed to tell the truth; but when she assures us, that her brother Charles himself informed her, that he had been with difficulty persuaded to the murder of the Admiral; and of some other Hugonots to whom he was personally attached, we see no reason to doubt the truth or accuracy of what she relates. †

Her brother the Duke of Anjou was privy to the whole design; and therefore his account, where it tends to extenuate the guilt of the conspirators, is to be received with caution, as the evidence of an accomplice interested to throw a gloss over the transaction. As the Pere Griffet remarks of him, and of other projectors of the massacre, 'Plus ils en avoient de connaissance, moins on doit ajouter foi à leur témoignage, puisqu'ils n'en étoient si bien instruits, que parcequ'ils en étoient coupables.' ‡ But to do Henry justice, he neither affirms nor denies the existence of a premeditated plot to exterminate the Hugonots. His discourse, though containing a circumstantial narrative of what passed during the few days that preceded the massacre, is completely silent about

\* Thuanus.

† Mem. de Marguerite, 69-75. Ed. of 1715.

‡ Preuves, 163.



the previous plans and intentions of the Court. He tells us, that his mother and himself had been long jealous of the ascendancy which the Admiral had been acquiring over the King, and suspicious that he rendered them ill offices with that Prince. He describes a scene with his brother which corroborated these suspicions, and coolly relates, that on that slender foundation they resolved to assassinate the Admiral. The first attempt, he says, was made without the knowledge of the King; and when first informed of it, he describes Charles, believing it to have been perpetrated by the Guises, as inflamed and transported with fury at so daring an insult on his authority, committed in the very precincts of the palace; but, when informed of the truth, and urged by a variety of arguments from his Catholic counsellors, as consenting at last to the murder of the Admiral, and adding with an oath, that all the other Hugonots must perish with him. Many of the details in the narrative of the Duke of Anjou are inconsistent with those given by Margaret. Which we are to believe, it is immaterial to decide. There is nothing in either inconsistent with the belief of a long premeditated plot, which encountered a slight and temporary opposition from the irresolution of the King, at the moment it was ready for execution.

Some traits of perfidy exhibited by the King in the interval between the final arrangement and commencement of the tragedy, deserve to be recorded as illustrations of his character.

On the eve of the St Bartholomew, after he had given orders for the massacre next morning, he redoubled his kindness to the King of Navarre, and desired him to introduce some of his best officers into the Louvre, that they might be at hand in case of any disturbance from the Guises. These officers, as we have already related, were next morning disarmed, and butchered in his presence. \*

On the same evening some Hugonots, alarmed at the military movements in the town, communicated their apprehensions to the Admiral, who, to quiet their minds, sent word of what he had heard to the King. Charles replied, that Coligny and his friends had nothing to fear; that if guards had been stationed in different parts of the city, it was to keep the populace in awe, '*pacato igitur esset animo, omnia illa ad salutem procurari.*' †

\* Mem. de l'Etat. i. 206—Deserres, iv. 34—Matthieu, 342—Thuan. Lib. lii. § 8.

† Veramandus, 37—Deserres, iv. 34—Thuan. Lib. lii. § 3.

On the same evening he received with coldness a formal remonstrance of the Guises, complaining of the injurious calumnies raised against them, protesting their innocence, and demanding permission to leave Paris; and without giving, or affecting to give them satisfaction, he suffered them to quit his presence under his apparent displeasure: And, more effectually still to calm the suspicions of the Hugonots, he permitted the Duke of Anjou and bastard of Angoulême to circulate a report through Paris, that Montmorenci, the friend and cousin of the Admiral, had been sent for, with a military force, to maintain order in the capital. \*

On the day before the massacre, he appointed a detachment of his guards for the protection of Coligny, stationed them around his lodgings, and ordered them to permit no Catholic to approach the house; and, on pretence of affording farther security to the Admiral, he directed that all the houses in the neighbourhood should be abandoned by their Catholic tenants, and occupied by Hugonots, who were ordered, by public authority, to repair to that quarter from the different parts of the town where they resided. The guards thus stationed for the protection of Coligny were employed next morning to murder him; and his friends, collected within a small space, were slaughtered without the possibility of concealment or escape. But it is doubtful, or at least we have been unable to satisfy ourselves from the recital of historians, whether these orders were given before or after the final resolution to perpetrate the massacre next morning. It is a suspicious circumstance, however, that the command of the guard was confided to Cosseins, a known and determined enemy of Coligny. †

We cannot conclude with a more just and concise exposition of the result of our inquiry, than in the words of Pere Griffet, so directly at variance with the hypothesis of Dr Lingard. 'Il se peut que les dernieres mesures n'aient été prises que peu de jours avant l'exécution. Ce fut alors que l'on détermina dans les conseils secrets, le nombre des proscrits, la choix des assassins et le jour de massacre: mais il paroît certain que le projet étoit formé dès le tems que l'on fit la paix et la proposition de marier la sœur de Charles IX. avec le roi de Navarre.'

---

\* Thuan. Lib. liii. § 3.

† Thuan.

ART. V. *Mœurs Administratives, pour faire suite aux Observations sur les Mœurs et les Usages Français au Commencement du XIX. Siècle.* 2 tomes 12mo. Paris, 1825.

THE author of this work published, some time since, a successful *jeu-d'esprit*, under the title of 'L'Art de faire des Dettes,'—an art, in which the people of most countries are becoming now as great proficient as their governments. A long experience of the blessings of a *National Debt*, is sure to bring private debts into fashion; and when a Judge from the Bench—as was the case some time since in England—promulgates the merits and advantages of owing on a grand scale, it is but natural that individuals should try the efficacy of the practice on a small one. 'I would beseech you,' says Panurge, 'to leave me some few centuries of Debt, if it were for nothing but the exercise of my mind;'—and English politicians would be, perhaps, equally at a loss for such exercise, if there were, as Panurge expresses it, 'any parcel abated from off the principal sums they owe.' The same great advocate for borrowing and lending adduces another argument in favour of the practice, of which the books of some bankrupts in the late crisis would afford no unapt illustration. 'Against the opinion of most philosophers, that of nothing ariseth nothing, and without having bottomed on so much as that which is called the First Matter, did I out of nothing become such a maker and creator, that I have created—what? a gay number of fair and jolly creditors. And creditors, I will maintain it, even to the very fire itself, are fair and goodly creatures.'

The work before us is more elaborate, and, therefore, less amusing than 'L'Art de faire des Dettes.' In extending himself beyond the limits of a *brochure* into two respectable volumes, the author has committed that sort of mistake which success is most apt to generate. Writers are too often tempted thus to outgrow their strength;—the much lauded sonnetteer straggles forthwith into epics, and the epigrammatist, overpaid for his point, becomes voluminous and dull. This work, however, is by no means deficient in liveliness; and the object of the writer being to give an insight into the interior of public offices in France,—to sketch the manners and modes of life of official persons, and throw a light upon all the various wheels, from the Prime Minister down to the Clerk, by which the machine of government in that country is carried on, his book derives an interest, independent of its pleasantry, from the curio-

sity with which every thing relating to French politics is sought after at present.

It is, indeed, a matter of no inconsiderable interest to watch the progress of the excitement that now pervades all France, and to speculate as to the probable consequences that may result from it. On the great question—whether our neighbours are ever likely to attain rational liberty—the symptoms at present exhibited among them afford quite as much grounds for hope as for fear. The magnificent subscription for the family of General Foy—the enthusiasm which has spread through all classes in favour of the Greeks, to assist whose cause there are *Comités Philhelléniques* established in almost every great town;—the sensitive alarm with which such events as the disgrace of M. Montlosier, and the appointment of the Bishop of Strasbourg to be tutor to the young Prince, are viewed—these, and many other such indications of popular feeling, seem to prove, that there is a right spirit abroad through France, and that the people take that lively interest in public affairs which alone insures the honesty and efficacy of a government, by making every man in the community a centinel on its movements.

In the general courage and fairness of their legal tribunals—one of which has been honest enough to draw down upon itself a rebuke from Royalty, while another, in the case of the descendants of *La Chalotais* against the *Etoile*, has left a decision upon record worthy of the pages of Fenelon—we find that best and only pledge against the abuse of laws, which lies in the integrity and impartiality of those who administer them. The sympathy with which the Chamber of Peers has lately entered into the views of the people,—upon a subject, too, where it could be least expected from them, the rights of primogeniture,—speaks strongly for the liberal spirit of that body; as the eloquence which they displayed on that occasion, and the triumph they gained, speak no less strongly for their talents and power. The speeches, or rather essays, delivered by MM. Pasquier, Molé, de Barante, and de Broglie, exhibit a clearness and strength of argument, a range and depth of views, which but few of our Noble thinkers could rival. From the discourse of the Duc de Broglie—which, it is no mean praise to say, was the best that this important occasion called forth—we cannot resist the temptation of giving the following extract, which, besides affording a specimen of the Noble orator's powers, is interesting, as containing the bold and candid opinions of so enlightened a foreigner upon the institutions of Great Britain:—

‘ C’est aussi là ma réponse à d’autres orateurs, dont j’honore les

vices, mais dont je ne partage point les chimères ; à d'autres orateurs qui, éblouis et comme enchantés par l'exemple d'un pays voisin, rêvent en ce moment la possibilité d'instituer en France, non pas une noblesse de cour ou de province, mais une aristocratie libre et fière, puissante et majestueuse, protectrice éclairée des libertés populaires.

‘ Les temps en sont passées. Desormais toutes les classes de la nation Française, sont également émancipées ; que l'on tourmente la population en tout sens, on n'en fera plus sortir ni clients ni patrons ; on n'en fera plus sortir que des Magistrats et des Citoyens. Si c'est là un mal ou un bien, je laisse chacun le décider selon qu'il l'entend : quant à moi j'en suis—fier et j'en rends grâces au ciel. Il y a des choses d'ailleurs qui ne se font, ni à la main, ni après coup.

‘ Oui, je le sais, le droit de primogéniture existe en Angleterre ; il y existe plus dur, plus injuste cent fois que la loi actuelle ne nous le propose ; tous les bien-fonds vont à l'aîné ; tous sans exception ; les puînés n'ont de ressources qu'une église riche jusqu'à la profusion, jusqu'au scandale, que l'armée, où les grades s'achètent et se vendent ; que des sinecures sans nombre et sans mesure ; qu'une foule de postes lucratifs dans les colonies ; que l'Inde où, si longtemps cinquante millions d'hommes ont été livrés en pâture à la rapacité des exacteurs. Oui, je le sais la distinction des rangs en Angleterre est conservée avec une exactitude pointilleuse et pédantesque ; le gouvernement depuis plusieurs siècles y appartient, à-peu-près exclusivement, à un petit nombre de grandes familles qui, rangées sous des étendards différents, se disputent et se transmettent le pouvoir, selon le vent de l'opinion qui domine ; tous les détails de l'administration sont dévolus à une vaste corporation de gentilshommes, qui, sous les noms de juges de paix, de grands jurys, font tout, décident de tout, disposent de tout-gratuitement, j'en tombe d'accord, mais aussi affranchis de tout contrôle, exempts de toute responsabilité positive. Et pourtant j'ai hâte de le déclarer hautement ; quelque préjugé qui s'élève au premier abord contre un tel ordre de choses, l'aristocratie Anglaise honore l'humanité ; c'est un imposant phénomène dans le monde et dans l'histoire ; associée de tout temps aux intérêts du peuple, elle n'a jamais cessé de revendiquer les droits du moindre citoyen, aussi courageusement que les siens propres ; elle a ouverte la route où la nation marche aujourd'hui ; elle a couru les mêmes chances, défendu la même cause, combattu le même combat. Depuis cent cinquante ans que la victoire est gagnée, elle n'a ni dévié ni dégénéré ; elle a sans cesse accueilli dans son sein toutes les supériorités qui se sont élevées ; une heureuse émulation, digne fruit des institutions libres qu'elle a fondées, s'est maintenue dans les hauts rangs ; l'aristocratie Anglaise est encore aujourd'hui l'élite de l'Angleterre, de cette Angleterre elle-même qui tient le premier rang parmi les peuples libres.’

Another strong ground of hope for the political advancement

of our neighbours, is the activity and talent of their periodical press. It is impossible for a nation to go asleep over its liberties, that has such daily *flappers* in its ears as the *Courier Français* and the *Journal des Débats*, the latter of which is, perhaps, the best conducted Journal—not excepting even our own admirable *Times*—in Europe. The conformation, too, and character of the Opposition which these two papers represent, is of a nature particularly favourable to the diffusion of sound, constitutional views—consisting, as it does, of two distinct parties, one of which supports the Charte upon monarchical principles, while the other maintains it upon more democratic and revolutionary grounds. A rational balance of opinion is thus preserved between them, and the public mind saved from either of those extremes, to which an Opposition purely Royalist, or purely Democratic, might force it.

To these promising circumstances in the political condition of France, there are others, of a nature at least equally discouraging, to be opposed. Among these must be reckoned a no less essential consideration than the character of the people themselves, whose appetite for novelty, fed as it has been so abundantly for the last half century, will hardly allow them to rest at the right point when they have found it, and whose readiness to be excited by trifles requires a considerable deduction to be made from the value and trust-worthiness of their zeal upon important concerns. When we see enthusiasm pouring itself out upon frivolous objects—like the thunder-cloud, parting with its contents to a kite—we lose one of the tests by which its importance on affairs of more moment can be estimated. The reveries of Animal Magnetism and Somnambulism have already, we believe, supplanted in Paris the disquisitions on the *droit d'aînesse*, and the cry against the Jesuits; and the cures performed by young ladies in their sleep (the magnetic power enabling them, in that state, to see into the interior of their patients \*) have excited sensation and discussion

---

\* This miraculous application of the powers of magnetism to medical purposes has, of course, superseded the 'eau magnétisée' of MM. Mesmer and Deleuze, which used formerly to work such wonders. Some of these somnambulist have equally the power of scrutinizing their own interior; and M. Puyégur, one of the great upholders of the mystery, gives an account of a girl who, during her magnetic slumber, saw four large worms gnawing her heart. She prescribed for herself accordingly; and, as M. Puyégur assures us, got rid of the worms. It is only among a people long worked upon by priestcraft, that such juggling as this could have the smallest chance of success.

enough to attract to them the solemn notice of the Académie de Médecine.

'Faire sérieusement les choses frivoles,' is nearly as much a characteristic of the French now, as it was in the days of Montesquieu; and, from this habit of theirs of doing foolish things with a grave face, we should be in great danger of being deceived, were we to measure their sense of the importance of a business by the seriousness and earnestness with which they set about it. This sort of fantastic solemnity is particularly observable in those writers among them who set up for broachers of new systems or theories. M. Azais, who, satisfactorily to himself, proves that Man is but a fortuitous excrescence, a mere 'développement spontané d'une mousse'—M. Beyle, who sees, in the working of the human passions, nothing more than a process of crystallization, and who would say of a young lady, when she first falls in love, that 'her heart begins to crystallize,'—M. de Monville, who insists that the world, and all it contains, is composed of four different sorts of little triangular-pyramidical-shaped molecules, with four equal faces,—all these sages, and many more of the same profundity that might be mentioned, maintain their respective theories with a gravity and earnestness, which show the importance that vanity can attach to its own whims, and prove, that what would pass for but an indifferent joke in England, may, in the hands of an ingenious Frenchman, be promoted into philosophy. Almost a natural consequence of this habit of treating trifles seriously is the far more dangerous error of viewing important matters as trifles; and, when we see so many instances of *both* these tendencies among our neighbours, it is impossible not to fear that the same false standard may be applied by them to politics,—that the habit of extracting self-glorification from every thing, (like the projector of Laputa, who extracted sun-beams out of cucumbers), may incapacitate them from understanding real glory, and that the same vanity which, at one time, makes such parade of the *shadow* of liberty, may, at another time, be equally ready, for its own triumph, to sacrifice the *substance*.

Another great obstacle to the advancement of free principles in France is that revived spirit of fanaticism, of which the Court is the soul and centre, and which, by bringing into play some of the worst features of the Catholic faith, draws down disgrace upon this religion, both in France and elsewhere, and not only embarrasses the friends of liberty in that country, but affords its enemies a new pretext for oppressing their fellow-countrymen in this. We have no doubt that the greater portion of the intelligent people of France regard these advances of bigotry

and ultramontanist \* with disgust. But the spirit of Jesuitism, once put in motion, is not so easily checked;—like the land-crab, it will make its way through all obstacles; and a people who see established among them, under the sanction of the Government and the Church, a Society, † whose stock in trade consists of Plenary Indulgences, and whose members are required, as their sole qualification, to repeat punctually ‘a Pater and Ave *par jour*,’ must be indebted more to their own good sense than to the wisdom or good intentions of their Government, if they do not retrograde in freedom even faster than they have advanced—till, like their rulers, living only in the past, they come to resemble those people mentioned by Dante, whose faces were turned backwards, and who, accordingly, saw nothing but what was *behind* them!

Almost equally mischievous with this ecclesiastical interference is the direct personal influence which, notwithstanding the interposition of ministerial agency, the Monarch still continues to hold over the minds of the whole community, and which must long, we fear, prevent the French from attaining that abstract and constitutional notion of the Royal power, upon which not only the theory but the practice of a government like theirs depends. To the mind of a Frenchman, the idea of a King always presents itself in the pompous form and attitude of that portrait of Louis XIV. at Versailles, under

---

\* In the controversy, to which this state of things has given rise, between the Ultramontanists on one side, and the champions of the liberties of the Gallican Church on the other, we find not a few instances of that unfairness which is so common a characteristic of theological disputes. For example,—Bossuet, in his Defence of the Orthodoxy of the Gallican Church, has said, that, even if the Declaration of 1682 were out of the question, the principles on which it was founded, would nevertheless remain unshaken and uncensured: ‘*Abeat ergo declaratio—manet inconcussa et censuræ omnis expers prisca illa sententia Parisiensium.*’ Of this sentence M. de la Menais, and other Ultramontane writers who quote it, omit all but the first three words—‘*Abeat ergo declaratio*’—as if Bossuet had said and meant, ‘Away, then, with the declaration!’

The Bishop of Hermopolis, in his late exposition of the state of ecclesiastical affairs, has evidently endeavoured to weaken the force of this Antipapal document; saying of it—‘*Que Louis XIV. lui donna en quelque sorte une existence légale, non que ce grand roi voulût en faire un point de doctrine, mais parce qu’il dût penser qu’une déclaration approuvée par tous les évêques avoit quelque chose de respectable.*’

† La Propagation de la Foi.



which is so appropriately inscribed, 'Le Roi gouverne par lui-même;' and the language of many of their political writers at this day shows how wholly the safety and convenience of the doctrine of ministerial responsibility is misunderstood by them. The vanity, indeed, of the whole nation makes common cause with the vanity of the Sovereign; and they could more easily dispense with a King altogether, than retain him on a reduced allowance of that prostration which, from habit, it has become a sort of second nature in them to pay. As long as this old 'Grand Monarque' feeling exists, it must stand considerably in the way of all advances towards a free and manly tone of political thinking. We have quite enough of such deference to the corporeal part of Royalty among ourselves; but in France the Monarch, in person, meets you every where. His wishes enter into the concoction of every public measure; and there is not a public institution that is not warped by this habitual inclination towards his will;—just as the women of the Grand Turk's seraglio, from their habit of leaning towards their lord, are said to grow crooked on the side at which the Sultan sits.

The author of the work, which has led us into these few general observations, gives the following explanation of his motives and design in writing it:—

'J'ai voulu, dans les lettres que je publie, tracer en riant une sorte de *Cours d'administration*.

'Le libraire les a fait imprimer, parce qu'il les croit *amusantes*; moi, parce que je les crois *utiles*.

'L'administration envahit tout; les administrateurs pullulent; et pourtant les quatre-vingt-dix-neuf vingtièmes de la population ignorent complètement quelle est la nature de cette force motrice qui, nous poussant, à coups d'ordonnances, de réglemens et d'arrêtés, nous contraint à marcher droit sur la grande route de l'obéissance.

'C'est une étude à faire: soyons moutons, je le veux bien; marchons docilement et en troupeaux, puisqu'il y a nécessité à produire de la laine, surtout puisqu'il faut paître, et paître dans les champs permis; mais, moutons observateurs, sachons au moins quelle longueur ont les houlettes de nos bergers; quand et pourquoi ils lancent contre nous leurs chiens dévoués; et, s'il est de notre destinée d'être tondus, apprenons du moins l'art de brouter opportunément, et de bêler à propos.

'Elle est innombrable la foule de gens qui paient leurs impôts et qui ignorent quelle est la puissance chargée d'ouvrir leur bourse de gré ou de force; ils ne savent pas le moins du monde par qui est mise en jeu cette grande machine ou vont s'engloutir des portions de leur argent dans des trous appelés *douane, octroi, impôt foncier, portes et fenêtres, patente, timbre, loterie*, etc.; ce sont autant de casse-cous dont ils ne connaissent point la profondeur, Qui les y pousse?

Peu leur importe : ils savent de père en fils qu'il y faut tomber, voilà tout. Leurs devoirs militaires, civils et politiques, ils les remplissent sous l'empire de la même ignorance.

‘ N'apercevez-vous pas qu'il y a derrière tout cela des ministres, des directeurs et des commis ? des préfets, des procureurs du roi, des gendarmes et des commissaires de police ? N'est-il pas à propos d'apprendre comment ces bergers-la se comportent ? De savoir comment ils nous parquent, nous marquent et nous comptent ? Vous sentez qu'il peut y en avoir de sorciers, ou plutôt de donneurs de sorts ; on en peut rencontrer qui dérobent le lait des brebis, qui leur tondent la laine sur le dos, et coupent même le cou à quelques agneaux.

‘ J'ai voulu faire connaître l'importance, la fainéantise, la cupidité et l'égoïsme de la plupart de ces bergers ; mais, au lieu de monter en chaire et d'affubler la critique de la robe noire et du bonnet carré, je l'ai habillée à la légère. ’

In proceeding to sketch the manner and habits of official personages, he begins, in due order, with the Minister, and describes to us all that is characteristic in his house and establishment. During the revolutionary times, it was not unusual to convert old convents into places of residence for the ministers. But this profane usurpation no longer exists. The religious corporations having resumed their rights, these houses are now restored to their former purposes ; holy water has purified away all official stains ; the bureaux have been regenerated into cells and confessionals ; and, where the Chiefs of Finance and Diplomacy brandished their unholy pens, some well-fed Congregationist, like the Hero of the Lutrin, now

‘ Chante les *Oremus*, fait des processions,  
Et répand à grands flots les benedictions. ’

The following picture of an unlucky minister, who, after superintending the construction of a new mansion for himself and suite, is—just as he has completed it to his heart's content—dismissed, affords a lesson on the mutability of ministerial affairs, which might well make some of the new-dwellers of Downing-Street tremble in their tenements :—

‘ Cette restitution aux congrégations, des domaines que le service de l'état avait envahis, a conduit à la nécessité des constructions, nécessité ruineuse pour les budgets, surtout pour les contribuables, mais très-profitable aux architectes des ministères. Dans ces cas fréquens, le plan de construction est ordinairement tracé par le ministre en place, qui travaille, en cela, pour son successeur. Ceci fournirait matière à une excellente comédie. Il faut voir avec quel soin Son Excellence recommande l'antichambre, la salle à manger, le petit salon, le grand salon, et l'escalier dérobé. Jusqu'à ce que le plan soit bien arrêté, les affaires d'état sont mises à l'arrière. Madame est consultée, et prévoit aussi pour les aises de la femme du prochain mi-

nistre. Le grand jour la fatigue : les carreaux du boudoir seront en verre dépoli. Elle tient à communiquer avec ses enfans sans traverser les grands appartemens ? Vite, un escalier en colimaçon est percé dans le petit corps de logis. Il faut que la nourrice et la femme de chambre aient deux appartemens voisins. C'est l'affaire d'une aile à ajouter au bâtiment du nord. Les maçons ont fini, la menuiserie et la serrurerie sont achevées, les peintures sont sèches et ne donnent plus d'odeur ; le déménagement a commencé. Arrive la fatale ordonnance qui nomme le successeur : il n'a rien à apporter que son bonnet de nuit ; son prédécesseur a pensé à tout.'

He then describes, with some liveliness, the mansion of his excellence :—

' Avant de loger les bureaux, il faut loger le ministre et sa suite. Cela exige tout un hôtel. La porte est cochère, cela va sans dire : à droite et à gauche sont plantés des supports qui datent de 1793, et qui, depuis cette époque, ont reçu des lampions en l'honneur de tous les gouvernemens ; car les lampions ne se sont point encore avisés d'avoir d'opinion : ils brûlent pour tout le monde. Au-dessus de cette porte courent ordinairement quelques vieilles sculptures ; souvent des Hercules avec leurs massues ; quelquefois des *Libertes* qu'on a depuis décoiffées, conceptions republicaines que l'on doit à des sculpteurs dont le ciseau converti produit aujourd'hui des saint Jean-Baptiste et des apôtres. Dans quelque coin de la corniche, on distingue les restes d'une inscription en lettres rouges, que le temps a insultées ; l'œil a bientôt complété leurs contours, et lit avec facilité ces mots : *Propriété nationale à vendre*. On entre, et l'on voit, attendant au massif de la porte, un petit pavillon de nouvelle construction, qui est destiné au logement du suisse : ce pavillon se compose de deux pièces par bas, et de deux chambrettes à l'étage supérieur ; il y a de la quoi loger le suisse et sa femme.

' La cour est spacieuse : cinquante carrosses y tiennent à l'aise. Là, un brin d'herbe ne s'aviserait pas de demander l'hospitalité au petit intervalle qui sépare deux pavés : il serait à l'instant foulé par un pied de cheval ou de solliciteur. L'herbe a de l'instinct, et n'ose pousser que dans la cour d'un hôpital ou d'une bibliothèque.'

The feelings of a dismissed minister on leaving his official residence—that moment, when

' Soul and body rive not more at parting  
Than greatness going off'—

are touched upon with suitable pathos ; and the occupations of the fallen functionary on the night previous to his decampment are thus described :—

' Un feu des plus actifs a été allumé dans le cabinet du ministre ; l s'y est enfermé avec son secrétaire intime. Là tous deux passent une partie de la nuit à faire une revue générale des cartons et des papiers. Cette opération est importante ; elle a ses règles et ses principes. On fait trois tas :—papiers inutiles ; papiers à emporter ; papiers à brûler.

‘ On range parmi les papiers inutiles les *vues d'améliorations* et les *projets d'économie*. On laisse toujours cela à son successeur.

‘ Les papiers à emporter se composent de rapports confidentiels sur le personnel, et principalement de *notes secrètes*. On n'a dit que la vérité, mais alors on était payé pour cela, et il ne faut pas se faire d'ennemis gratis. On emporte encore, et cela très-soigneusement, des protestations faites au ministre *en place* par M. le duc, par madame la duchesse. On ne sait pas ce qui peut arriver, et ces témoignages-là, dans une autre occasion, serviront de points d'appui. Enfin on emporte certains travaux d'ensemble, ouvrage de quelque bon commis, ou sont analysées toutes les ressources du ministère, et qui pourront, au besoin, aider à la critique de l'administration du nouveau ministre.

‘ On brûle une multitude de petites situations, de petits états qui mettraient trop promptement le successeur au courant du travail ; on brûle la minute d'un discours inédit de son excellence à la chambre des députés ; on brûle un projet de règlement sur le *rappel à l'ordre*, le manuscrit d'une petite brochure sur les *inconvéniens des chambres parlantes*, une foule de documens où les circonstances nouvelles semblent faire ressortir des contradictions ; on brûle enfin des demandes de places et des dénunciations. La flamme s'élance de tous côtés : c'est un feu d'enfer.

‘ Voilà comme un ministre disgracié met de l'ordre dans ses papiers. Il a fini. Cinq heures du matin viennent de sonner. Son Excellence tombe sur le canapé du cabinet particulier, et, pour la première fois, le duvet de son double coussin lui semble dur. Pendant deux heures, elle se retourne sur le dos, sur l'estomac, sur les flancs gauche et droit pour chercher le sommeil ; elle allait dormir lorsqu'arrive le réveil-matin qui voici :

‘ Louis, par la grâce de Dieu, etc. (Suit l'acceptation de la démission.)

‘ Louis, par la grâce de Dieu, etc. (Suit la nomination du nouveau ministre.)

‘ La partie officielle du *Moniteur* a appris au monde bien des désastres ; mais jamais elle n'en a fait retentir aux oreilles d'un ministre de plus épouvantables que ceux qu'il trouve dans ces ordonnances de remplacements. Combien ont lu le vingt-neuvième bulletin d'un œil sec, qui ont senti leurs larmes couler pour un nom mis à la place du leur ! On apprend sans frémir l'anéantissement de cent cinquante mille hommes, mais la perte de cent cinquante mille francs se peut-elle supporter ?

‘ Il est sept heures du matin. Le ministre a déjà relu deux fois les deux ordonnances. Ce n'est qu'un protocole, et cependant chaque mot, chaque virgule, fournit à son mécontentement le sujet d'un long commentaire. Il y a long-temps qu'il ne s'impose aucune contrainte devant son secrétaire intime. Il s'explique à peu près en ces termes sur l'une et l'autre ordonnance, en forçant le *Moni-*

teur, qu'il mutile entre ses doigts, à subir les mille tortures dont son âme est déchirée :

“ *Nous avons ordonné !* Croirai-je jamais que ce soit le roi qui ait ordonné cette injustice ? Il fallait mettre, *l'intrigue a ordonné*. Qu'en pensez-vous, monsieur ?—Ah ! Monseigneur !—Je sais d'où part le coup ; il vient du Comte que ma fermeté incommode ; moi seul lui résistais au conseil ; tous les autres saluent son avis. Il n'y avait de tête que sur mes épaules. Les sots n'ont pas vu qu'ils ne tenaient que par moi ; il les fera sauter tous ; il les ménage encore ; mais une fois qu'il tiendra le budget. Croiriez-vous qu'il tranche du diplomate ? Il m'a serré la main hier ; mais ma destitution était écrite dans ses regards, et je l'avais devinée.—Qui pourra, après Monseigneur, supporter le fardcau d'un ministère si important ?—Moi ? j'en suis incapable : lisez l'ordonnance : *ma santé ne me permet pas*. Quelle insultante ironie ! Je vous demande si jamais je me suis mieux porté. Ai-je rien dit, rien fait qui pût faire soupçonner que je fusse malade ? M'a-t-on vu, pendant la session interrompre mes dîners ? N'en ai-je pas donné six par semaine ? Certes, j'y prêchais d'exemple et ne faisais point, comme tant d'autres, semblant de manger ; mais remarquez ceci ; *ayant agréé la démission*. Vous me connaissez : m'avez-vous entendu quelquefois parler de démission ?—Jamais, Monseigneur.—Jamais : mon dévouement était trop connu, trop éprouvé ; j'aurais péri au poste ou la confiance du roi m'avait appelé. Plutôt que de donner ma démission, on m'aurait arraché du ministère, oui, monsieur, arraché en morceaux.—Le courage de Monseigneur est connu.—Et c'est le président du conseil des ministres qui se charge (*montrant le Moniteur*), vous le voyez, ce n'est pas moi qui l'invente, qui se charge d'exécuter cette ordonnance !—Son nom n'est là que pour la forme.—*Donné à Paris, au château des Tuileries !* il fallait mettre : *donné rue d. . . à l'hôtel du comte*. Au surplus, c'est à tort que je m'offenserais ; cette seconde ordonnance justifie la première. Quand monsieur. . . arrive au ministère, il est clair que je ne saurais y demeurer. Vous connaissez sans doute les titres de mon successeur ?—Monseigneur. . .—Eh ! qui ne les connaît pas ? ils datent de 93, de la Convention et du Conseil des cinq cents ; voué ensuite au Directoire, le premier consul en a hérité, puis Napoléon, puis le gouvernement royal, puis encore Napoléon, puis encore le gouvernement royal.”

“ Cette biographie impromptu du successeur a soulagé le cœur de Son Excellence ; pendant ce discours, le Moniteur, qui n'en peut mais, s'est changé, sous ses doigts, en une boule parfaite ; elle échappe aux mains de Son Excellence qui, se trouvant ainsi sans occupation, retombe dans un accès de tendresse pour son secrétaire intime.

“ En quittant le ministère, je compte, lui-dit-elle, au nombre de mes chagrins les plus cuisans, celui que j'éprouve à me séparer de vous. Je vous ai ménagé un abri. Voici votre nomination de chef de bureau : elle est datée d'hier. (*Avec un soupir*). J'étais encore ministre !”

The following receipt for making *sinecures* might have been of use to some former Ministers of our own.

‘ Vous me demanderez ce que c’est qu’un secrétaire général ? Cette désignation présente à l’esprit une sorte de *factotum* qui tient la plume pour tout ; c’est précisément le contraire : le secrétaire général ne tient la plume pour rien ; son métier est de contresigner. Par exemple, le ministre prend un arrêté, fait une instruction, ou adresse une circulaire à ses agens ; il signe ces documens. Eh bien ! le secrétaire général atteste que la signature apposée par le ministre, est en effet la signature du ministre. Je me suis toujours demandé pourquoi on avait borné là cette espèce de légalisation ; car vous concevez que, si la signature du ministre a besoin d’être certifiée véritable, la même nécessité semble se présenter pour la signature du secrétaire général ; or, en considérant que ce dernier certificat aurait lui-même besoin d’être certifié par un deuxième secrétaire général, il faut reconnaître qu’on a appliqué là le commencement d’un plan qui conduirait droit au système des infinis. Je suis étonné qu’on l’ait arrêté en si bon chemin, car il offrait le moyen le plus sûr, et le moins sujet à critique, de créer des *sinécures* : il était du moins conséquent dans toutes ses parties, avantage que n’ont pas tous les plans ministériels.’

Some characteristic traits of Napoleon are given ; and the praise bestowed upon him in this and in other recent publications shows, that the injunction under which his name so long lay in France has at last been taken off, and that his memory begins to enter into the full possession of its rights. To a ruler who, like him, took the thinking department all upon himself, nothing was wanting but men who could *work* ; and the value which he attached to such downright machines of business is well exemplified in the following anecdote :—

‘ Ces chefs de division étaient la pièce essentielle, la principale roue d’engrenage de la machine administrative ; ils recevaient, en premier ordre, la force motrice et la communiquaient à toutes les parties. L’utilité de ces excellens ouvriers était bien connue du chef du gouvernement. Son impatience de savoir, ses questions soudaines, directes et positives, changeaient en une torture les jours de travail de ses ministres. Avant de monter en voiture, ils se chargeaient de renseignemens, de notes et de chiffres ; ils empruntaient le secours de petits calepins, de petits agendas, où la prévoyance la plus ingénieuse inscrivait succinctement des réponses à toutes les questions possibles. Ces pauvres ministres apprenaient cela par cœur, le matin, le soir ; c’étaient leurs racines grecques ; mais le malheur voulait souvent que, forts sur la leçon de la veille, ils fussent questionnés sur celle du lendemain. Ils restaient courts.

Parmi les chefs de division, se trouvaient souvent des hommes distingués, dont de bonnes études avaient préparé les esprits à tous les genres de succès. Jetés, par les circonstances, dans l’administra-

tion, qui offre de fréquens moyens de faire ressortir les avantages d'un bon jugement, d'une rédaction prompte, lucide et concluante, d'une discussion serrée et analytique, ceux-la ne tardaient pas à être remarqués par Napoléon ; ils étaient appelés près de lui toutes les fois que le ministre répondait de travers. Lorsque le chef de division satisfaisait couramment et sans hésitation aux vives interrogations de Napoléon, il revenait ordinairement des Tuileries avec le ruban de la légion-d'honneur ou la dignité de conseiller d'Etat. C'était là, madame, un des dédommagemens de ce règne de fer : quand un homme avait du talent, chef, sous-chef ou commis, dans quelque rang obscur que la fortune l'eût placé, Napoléon, de son bras herculéen, le saisissait par les cheveux, l'a posait sur un piédestal, et disait : *Voilà ma créature.*

‘ Cette disposition de Napoléon à élever le talent qui languissait dans les bureaux, fut un jour bien voisine de tomber à faux. Le trait est assez comique pour être rapporté.

‘ Si nous comptions quelques sujets de mérite parmi nos chefs de division, vous devez bien penser que le destin capricieux ne nous épargnait pas non plus ce qu'on appelle très-communément les *ganaches*. Mais il est de ces ganaches qui ont leur talent propre, leur aptitude spéciale, et que souvent un homme supérieur suppléerait mal dans la partie technique qu'elles ont l'habitude de pratiquer.

‘ M. X. était chef de division, sous le ministère du duc de F. Ce M. X., homme de cinquante ans environ, était honnête et grand travailleur ; mais son travail se bornait à recevoir, de tous les points de l'Europe et de la France, des états de situation qu'il dépouillait, dans la vue d'établir combien de soldats étaient présens sous les armes, combien en congé, combien aux hôpitaux. Cette occupation constante avait fait de M. X. une mécanique à additions ; il additionnait ses bataillons au bureau, dans la rue, à table, au lit ; ses rêves et ses cauchemars redemandaient, à sa femme épouvantée une compagnie égarée, une escouade perdue ; il mêlait ses chiffres et ses colonnes à ses communications même d'amitié ou de simple politesse et vous aurait volontiers incorporé pour porter au grand complet le régiment où il lui manquait un homme. M. X. avait en outre la mémoire des lieux où était situé chaque corps de troupes : sa tête était un véritable *livret d'emplacement*.

‘ Le développement de l'un de ces vastes projets qui ébranlaient le monde conduisant Napoléon à jeter les bases d'une nouvelle organisation militaire, il travailla pendant plusieurs jours avec le duc de F., homme d'un sens droit, d'une raison éclairée, mais dont la mémoire n'avait rien de comparable à celle de M. X., qui était, dans ce genre-là, une espèce de Lemazurier. Les séances commençaient à devenir laborieuses pour le duc de F., attendu que Napoléon demandait incessamment où était le dépôt du 45<sup>e</sup>., du 54<sup>e</sup>., du 108<sup>e</sup>., et que le pauvre duc, à chaque nouvelle question, feuilletait, tournait, et retournait l'énorme dictionnaire dont l'avait chargé M. X. “ Je crois, dit avec timidité le duc harassé, que la présence de

M. X., chef de la division du mouvement des troupes, pourrait être ici utile à Votre Majesté.—Faites-le venir.”

‘ A ces mots, un officier d’ordonnance part, arrive au ministère, emballe le pauvre M. X., l’amène aux Tuileries, et le lance dans le cabinet de Napoléon. Toute autre mémoire que celle de M. X. eût été troublée de ce mouvement et de cette présentation ; rien ne pouvait altérer la sienne. “ Bonjour, monsieur ; où sont les trois premiers bataillons du 48<sup>e</sup>. ?—A Ratisbonne —Le quatrième ?—A Ancône, armée d’Italie.—Le cinquième ?—A Vittoria, 4<sup>e</sup>. corps de l’armée d’Espagne.—Et son dépôt ?—Ostende.—Présens sous les armes ?—3,455.—Hôpitaux ?—223.—Les congés ?—44 —Détachés ? —Deux compagnies du cinquième.—Aux eaux ?—3.”

‘ A ce dialogue, dont l’épreuve s’étendit immédiatement à plusieurs corps, avec la même rapidité dans les questions, et le même aplomb dans les répliques, Napoléon reste frappé d’étonnement. Il tire à part le duc de F. “ Vous avez-là, lui dit-il, un homme extraordinaire.” Puis, se tournant vers M. X. : “ Vous pouvez vous retirer ; vous aurez de mes nouvelles. Monsieur le duc de F., reprend alors Napoléon, vous me proposerez demain M. X. pour la place de conseiller d’Etat.—Je prie Votre Majesté de me permettre de lui faire observer que cela n’est point possible.—Comment ?—M. X. n’a que des chiffres dans la tête ; il ne saurait pas rédiger un rapport. Pour être conseiller d’Etat. . . —Eh bien donc ! je lui en fais le traitement.” Le bon M. X. avait douze mille francs d’appointemens comme chef de division ; cette séance lui en valut vingt-quatre mille.

‘ Ces scènes étaient fréquentes aux temps où tous les bras ne suffisaient point au travail et à l’activité qu’exigeaient les colossales entreprises du gouvernement.’

The *Commis* or Clerks appear to be the class of official persons, with which this painter of ‘mœurs administratives’ is best acquainted,—having been, himself, it seems, one of that operative body. Accordingly he describes, with much feeling, the scantiness of their salaries and the superabundance of their work ; the perpetual alarm in which they are kept by rumours of retrenchment, and the never-ending trouble which the motions for papers and amendments of the opposition inflict upon them. Benjamin Constant, it appears, has as many official maledictions showered upon him in Paris as Mr Hume has in London.

‘ Je sais bien que les amendemens m’ont mis sur les dents. M.B. C., auquel on conteste la qualité de Français, et qui vient de partir pour trouver quelque bonne preuve capable de clore la bouche à ses adversaires, m’a fait, durant toute une session, passer la vie la plus abominablement laborieuse. Je vous déclare, à raison de l’intérêt que je porte à mes anciens camarades, que je fais des vœux bien sincères pour qu’il soit déclaré étranger, archi-étranger.’



To the great relief, however, of the Clerks, as well as of the Ministers, the last elections have reduced the ranks of the Opposition to a very manageable number, and the *Bureaux* are now enjoying comparative repose.

‘Ce mot d’*opposition* cause à juste titre l’effroi des employés. Il m’a coûté tant de peines et de fatigues, que ses cinq syllabes agitent encore tous mes nerfs. On a donné de bien vilaines figures aux diables, aux démons et aux sorciers ; l’opposition est plus laide que tout cela : on la voit dans les bureaux, telle que Virgile a dépeint la Renommée.

*Monstrum horrendum, ingens, cui quot sunt corpore plumæ,*

*Tot vigiles oculi subter (mirabile dictu),*

*Tot linguæ, totidem ora sonant, tot surrigit aures.*

‘Pendant, le dernier trait

*Tot linguæ, totidem ora sonant,*

tombe tout-à-fait à faux : grâce aux dernières élections, l’opposition a perdu plus de quatre-vingts langues : la voilà presque muette. Si j’étais encore commis, je ferais des vœux pour qu’elle devint sourde, et qu’elle fût bientôt réduite, comme les élèves de l’abbé Sicard, à ne plus s’exprimer que par signes.’

The same convenient views of economy on which our own Government has sometimes proceeded, in sweeping away whole swarms of unfortunate clerks, while they left the great consumers of the public treasure uncurtailed, by a single shilling, of their spoil, are frequently adopted and acted upon by the Ministers of our neighbours, to whom, indeed, we seem to have afforded an ‘*exemplar vitiiis imitabile*’ throughout. This favourite mode of retrenchment is thus pleasantly exposed :—

‘Des députés sont montés à la tribune, et, à l’occasion de la discussion du budget, l’ont fait retentir des phrases que voici, et que je n’invente point ; je copie le *Moniteur* :

“Partout d’énormes appointmens, des frais de bureaux immenses, des ARMÉES DE COMMIS, surchargent le trésor et insultent à la misère publique. Les hommes de plume continuent à écraser l’état et à encombrer les administrations.”

‘Cette sortie, fidèlement reproduite par tous les journaux du lendemain, est le triste avant-coureur d’une prochaine *organisation*. Elle a porté l’effroi dans le cœur des hommes de plume. Chacun cherche autour de soi s’il a quelque motif de réforme, et tremble d’en rencontrer de trop plausibles. Celui-ci, par exemple, se rappelle qu’il a un cousin qui a été sous-préfet de l’empire ; cet autre, une sœur qui fut marchande de modes d’une reine déchue. L’un s’accuse en secret d’avoir plaisanté une phrase de journal ministériel ; l’autre, d’avoir été prendre sa demi-tasse au café Lemblin. Tous enfin, en mangeant leur pain sec et en se désaltérant au pot-à-l’eau de ministère, craignent d’insulter à la misère publique ; ils vaudraient se dis-

simuler qu'ils appartiennent à quelque bataillon de ces armées de commis qui surchargent le trésor.

‘ Le ministre a donné un de ces dîners de cinquante couverts où le fumet du chevreuil et la vapeur de la truffe réunissent les suffrages et forment les majorités. Il a convoqué pour le soir même deux directeurs et le secrétaire général. Tous quatre sont déjà dans le cabinet de travail. “ Messieurs, dit Son Excellence, la Chambre crie contre la bureaucratie ; je dois donner l'exemple d'une grande réforme parmi les employés : il me faut 120,000 francs d'économie.— Hélas ! Monseigneur, vous voulez donc mettre à la porte soixante commis à 2,000 francs ?—Combien sont-ils ?—Six cents.—Arrangez-vous comme vous le voudrez, il faut en renvoyer un sur dix.—Soixante personnes, cela fera bien des mécontents.—Renvoyez donc quatre chefs de bureau, huit sous-chefs et vingt-huit commis ; frappez les gros appointemens, et vous ferez mes 120,000 francs avec quarante personnes au lieu de soixante ; cela est philanthropique. ”

‘ La base du travail est ainsi arrêtée. Il n'est venu à la pensée d'aucun de ces quatre messieurs qui touchent ensemble 270,000 francs, qu'en prenant à la lettre le conseil de Son Excellence, ils obtiendraient 120,000 francs d'économie, conserveraient encore 150,000 francs, et n'auraient personne à réformer. ’

Among other tender ties between the electors and the elected, for which the French are indebted to their imitation of us, those small services, vulgarly called *jobs*, which Ministerial Members are in the habit of performing for their constituents, have not, it appears, been overlooked ;—but, on the contrary, are considered as among the chief blessings of a Representative government. Places in the tobacco department are particularly in request among the electors.

‘ Remarquez que le système représentatif restauré a donné aux députés une importance qu'ils n'avaient point sous l'empire : leur vote fait les destinées des ministres. Les ministres tiennent le pouvoir ; c'est bien le moins que leur omnipotence accorde des faveurs et des grâces à ceux qui, par le jeu d'une boule, peuvent affaiblir ou détruire cette toute-puissance. Un grand nombre des électeurs provinciaux n'ignorent pas cette source de crédit des députés auprès des ministres, et, dans les choix qu'ils font, accordent, par un calcul de localité, leurs suffrages à quelques uns de ces notables qui ne connaissent dans toute la France que leur département.

‘ Ces députés-là portent dans le cœur l'enthousiasme de l'arrondissement et le fanatisme de la commune. Leur petite ville n'attend d'eux ni opposition, ni discours, ni amendemens : elle en espère des pas et des démarches ; ils sont de ceux auxquels on dit :

Il faut des actions et non pas des paroles.

Vous ne sauriez croire jusqu'à quelle profondeur de conviction ils sont pénétrés de ce côté d'utilité de leur mandat. A peine débarqués à Paris, les pétitions leur pleuvent, et ils en forment de vastes

dossiers où ils prennent soin d'inscrire les noms du directeur, du chef de bureau, du sous-chef et du commis que cela regarde. L'un sollicite la construction d'un petit pont ; l'autre, la percée d'un chemin vicinal. Plusieurs veulent faire des directeurs, des inspecteurs et des maîtres de poste ; quelques-uns, que nous envoient les départemens à tabac, aspirent à porter leurs concitoyens à tous les emplois que les contributions indirectes ont créés à la suite de cette plante, comme contrôleurs spéciaux de culture, garde-magasins, inspecteurs, sous-inspecteurs et chefs de fabrication.'

Under the ancient monarchy of France, all public appointments—those of Judges among the rest—were sold by the Crown.\* This monstrous abuse, which Montesquieu pays monarchy the ill compliment of thinking *necessary* to it, no longer exists ;—as our author says, ' Le Roi vous nomme pour rien, et les Ministres vous destituent gratis.' But if we may believe his statements,—though public officers no longer buy their places, they continue still, as grossly as ever, to sell the duties of them ; and for this spirit of cupidity and venality which, according to him, pervades every class of society in France, he thus satisfactorily accounts.

' Le dirai-je pourtant ? la corruption de nos mœurs administratives a peut-être une déplorable excuse dans l'exemple des jeux de fortune que nos révolutions leur ont présentés. Il faut en convenir : entre les deux époques de 1789 et de 1815, c'est-à-dire pendant trente ans, des événemens extraordinaires ont aventureusement déplacé toutes les sources des richesses territoriales, commerciales et industrielles. Chacun a pu, au moins une fois, y emplir son broc, comme aux vastes fontaines que le luxe des anniversaires érige à la soif populaire, où ce succès est réservé au plus fort et au plus adroit. Ces continuel spectacles d'opulences improvisées, ces soudaines élévations de fortunes de cinq minutes, ont répandu dans les membres du corps social une fièvre d'or et d'argent qui inégalise et accélère encore ses pulsations. Cette fièvre s'est surtout attaquée à l'administration qui, toujours exposée aux rappels, aux réformes, aux

---

\* By an official account given to Colbert in 1664, it appeared that the number of places in the two departments of Finance and Justice, was upwards of forty-five thousand, of which the salaries amounted to more than eighty millions of livres. These offices were all sold, and the money produced by the sale was part of the revenue. Each of these offices carried with it an exemption from taxes ; each new creation, therefore, diminished the permanent resources of the state. The current price of the whole of these offices, at that time, amounted to four hundred and nineteen millions, or about thirty millions Sterling.'—*History of Europe, from the Peace of Utrecht*, by Lord John Russell. See this very clever work, p. 213, for the attempt made by Colbert to reform this abuse.

rétraites, aux congés illimités et à tous les genres de disgrâces que les ministres ont inventés, cherche à la hâte à se créer des bien-être pendant ses courts instans d'activité.'

It is humiliating to be obliged to confess, that the same grasping avidity for gain, the same demoralizing spirit of speculation, which is here described as hurrying away all classes in France, has, from causes similar in their operation, become but too much the characteristic of Englishmen. What the Revolution and its sudden changes of property are said to have done in that country, the Bank Restriction Act and its consequences have assuredly effected here. A perpetually fluctuating currency has turned commerce into a game of chance; and, from a nation of gamblers, only the morals of a gambler are to be expected.

We shall here close our notice of this work, with the expression of our sincere wish, that France may be half as successful in obtaining the blessings of our form of Government, as she has evidently been in copying its corruptions and defects.

ART. VI. *Narrative of Travels and Discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, in the Years 1822, 1823, and 1824, by MAJOR DENHAM, CAPTAIN CLAPPERTON, and the late DOCTOR OUDNEY, extending across the Great Desert to the Tenth Degree of Northern Latitude, and from Kouka in Bornou, to Sackatoo, the Capital of the Fellatah Empire. With an Appendix, published by Authority of the Right Honourable Earl Bathurst, one of his Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, and Dedicated by Permission to his Lordship. By MAJOR DIXON DENHAM, of his Majesty's 17th Regiment of Foot, and CAPTAIN HUGH CLAPPERTON, of the Royal Navy, the Survivors of the Expedition. London, 1826.*

THE appearance of this work forms an era in modern discovery. We scarcely know, since the time of Marco Polo, with the exception perhaps of Park, any instance in which so much new ground has been gone over by any single mission. Regions have been surveyed, the very existence of which was before unknown—and others, of which only a faint rumour had reached across the immense deserts by which they were enclosed. The tract, too, is one on which Europeans, in an especial sense, have 'fixed their eyes till now, and pined with vain desire;' and the present discoveries are the more welcome, as they seem to be presented only as a prelude to the complete exploration of Africa, likely soon to be effected by British en-

terprise. On this subject, it seems but fair to acknowledge, that the present Administration have merited well of the cause of discovery. We give them less credit for what they did in the full hey-day of expectation, when the public concurred in every possible effort and sacrifice. But hope was extensively chilled by so many abortive and disastrous attempts; and ultimately, we believe, the national vote would have been, to throw up Africa as a hopeless and ruinous concern. Their adherence to the cause under such discouragements, has made it in the most honourable sense their own, and entitles them to a fair share in the glory of that important success with which it has at last been crowned.

Many circumstances must exempt the work before us from severe criticism as a literary production—which would be ungracious indeed towards those who have returned to us from the gates of death, with so much of important and interesting intelligence. To form a perfect traveller would require a rare union of active and speculative qualities, likely to occur only when men of cultivated minds,—a Volney, a Barrow, or a Humboldt,—have devoted themselves to this pursuit by a spontaneous impulse. The members of the present mission (Major Denham, Mr Clapperton, and Dr Oudney), acted chiefly as instruments in the hands of others. As good British officers, however, they performed arduous duties, boldly and diligently; and they achieved that in which many before them had failed. If the narrative, which seems given simply as it came from their pen, display no very high intellectual power or curious research, it still contains a plain and perspicuous narrative; and often, especially in Major Denham's case, lively and amusing pictures of the objects actually presented to them. We know not if it was advisedly, that they went out unfurnished with any previous ideas respecting the great objects which they were to explore: But they certainly seem to have carried out their minds a complete *tabula rasa* in relation to Africa. This has no doubt one salutary effect,—as the facts are given pure, not coloured or modified with a view to the support of any crude theory. Yet, with a slight tincture of African antiquity, they might have sifted some of the information they received; they might have doubted the recent origin ascribed to cities mentioned eight centuries ago by Edrisi; and they would not have passed over various means and objects of inquiry, from being unable to estimate their value. From the same cause they could of course do nothing to illustrate their own observations, by the lights of earlier inquirers. Major Rennell, too, was no longer ready to come forward, as in the early discoveries of the Association, to link them together, and connect them with the early histories

and descriptions of the Continent. An important desideratum is thus left, which, before closing this article, some attempt will be made to supply, though in a manner, we fear, very inadequate to the importance of the materials now furnished.

Government, ever on the watch for the means of exploring Africa, seems lately to have found a favourable opening at the court of Tripoli. This little state, so beset heretofore with ignorance and bigotry, had felt a glimmering of the light which shines on the European nations. The British, in particular, were favoured and courted, partly owing to the prudent conduct of Mr Warrington, the Consul, whose house had long been an asylum for all whom he chose to protect. Not less favourable to British views was the position of Tripoli in regard to Central Africa. Some recent incursions by her tributary, the Sultan of Fezzan, had spread far and wide the terror of the Tripolitan name. Her troops had obtained a superiority, like that of the Spaniards over the native Americans, from the use of fire-arms; while spears, javelins and arrows were still the most powerful weapons of Bornou and Soudan. A gun, in the heart of Africa, is the object almost of supernatural dread. Major Denham has observed several of the natives, when they saw one rested against a tree, hovering round it on tiptoe, speaking to each other only in whispers, and apparently attempting to sooth it by the most humble supplications. 'Could these poor creatures,' says Major Denham, 'be once made to understand the real state of an Arab's pouch, with two or three loads of bad powder, and the little dependence to be placed on his firelock, a miserable French piece, of the original value of about twelve shillings, that misses fire at least every other time, how much more justly would they estimate the Arab's strength!' However, the petty Bashaw of Tripoli, armed with such weapons, is considered by them the most powerful prince existing; and we are assured that it is regarded, in the interior, as matter of astonishment, that he had not compelled all Europe to embrace the Mahometan faith! An invasion from Tripoli is therefore the thing of all others most dreaded by the interior potentates. To offend the Bashaw appears to them the greatest of evils; and his recommendation is a safe passport from one end to the other of the Negro dominions. He assured the English mission that, under such a guarantee, the route from Tripoli to Bornou was as secure as that from London to Edinburgh; and the assertion, so far as man was concerned, was found not to pass the limits of Oriental hyperbole.

The first step was to proceed from Tripoli to Mourzouk, the capital of Fezzan. The Sultan of this little country reigned as

the Viceroy of the Bashaw, whose wishes he professed himself willing to fulfil; but, not having the same liberal spirit, he immediately began that system of delay and evasion which had baffled the mission under Messrs Lyon and Ritchie. As soon, however, as the present gentlemen were satisfied of this unfriendly disposition, they formed the decisive resolution of measuring back their dreary route to Tripoli; and on not receiving full satisfaction there, Major Denham had even set off for England, when he was recalled, and Boo-Khaloom, the leader of a great caravan, assigned as his guide to Bornou. Passing over the return to Mourzouk, we find the whole party, under the guidance of Boo-Khaloom, departing from that capital, to measure their path across those immense deserts which separated them from the regions of which they were in search.

The details of this expedition have made us better acquainted with that singular and complex character, an Arab caravan merchant. The term *merchant* in Africa, suggests something very different from that quiet, prudent, and diligent personage, who, while his *argosies* are floating on the ocean, remains seated in a snug apartment, counting the silent growth of cent. per cent. The Arab trader, on the contrary, must accompany his investments to their remotest destination, and through all the perilous and desolate tracts that intervene. He must renounce every local attachment, every feeling of country. His home is wherever the human foot can wander. His sole delight soon comes to be centered in this roving and irregular life; and even at an advanced age, and after passing through numberless dangers, his mind is often wholly occupied in planning new expeditions. To the character of a wanderer he must add another,—passing through regions which own no law but that of the strongest, and through routes every where beset with predatory hordes, he must arm himself and his followers, and must defend as a warrior what he has earned as a merchant. Unhappily he does not often stop here; but, imitating those with whom he contends, learns at last to consider plunder as a cheap, and even honourable mode of replenishing his stores. His staple commodity consisting of slaves, obtained always originally by violence, it becomes an obvious economy to be the captor rather than the purchaser. Provided, in short, he can make up a valuable assortment, he cares not whether it be earned with money or blood. He is equally at home, plundering the defenceless, driving an honest trade, or fighting like a hero on the field of battle. Thief, merchant, pedlar, prince and warrior, he holds himself equally ready, according to circumstances, to act in any of these capacities. His followers, being constantly armed and in movement, become a sort of little standing army,

and by their guns, the terror of the negro, acquire a very formidable military character. Whenever they enter any of the small interior kingdoms, they create a sort of *imperium in imperio*. The King, while he courts, and endeavours to extract the greatest possible advantage from them, anxiously watches their movements, and scarcely considers himself firmly seated on his throne while they are near it. As the buying and selling prices on the opposite sides of the desert are in the ratio of 150 to 500, to say nothing of what is paid for only in blows, the merchant who carries life and property safe through a series of such adventures, generally acquires very great wealth, and often rivals the pomp of princes. Sometimes he acquires also liberal and enlarged views, and a spirit of humanity foreign to the course of life in which he is involved. He makes a loud profession of Mahometan zeal; yet the habit of varied intercourse with mankind greatly softens his personal bigotry. Even the rage for proselytism, characteristic of a sect which confines salvation so strictly within its own pale, is greatly abated by that article of the Mahommedan law, which prohibits the making slaves of any of the same faith; so that should the happy moment arrive, when the gates of paradise were opened to all unbelievers, he might ruefully exclaim, 'Orhello's occupation's gone.'

Of this bad class, Boo-Khaloom, the protector of the mission, was rather a favourable specimen. He had accumulated immense wealth, and was considered the second man in Fezzan, rivalling even the Sultan, both as to influence with the people and favour with the Bashaw. His *entrées* into the great towns were made almost with regal pomp,—in robes of silk and velvet embroidered with gold, one only of which (the burnouse) had cost four hundred dollars. His fine Tunisian horse was also covered with velvet cloth richly embroidered; and his followers, richly dressed and caparisoned, rode in a long train behind him. To his countrymen he was so liberal and generous, that he was considered almost as the common benefactor of Fezzan. In pursuing a trade, so much of which was evil, he showed a great preference for the lawful and honourable departments, and was dragged into the opposite chiefly by the urgency of his followers, and the impossibility of otherwise holding them attached to him. He made a boast also of treating the victims of his predatory excursions with a humanity of which there were few other examples, and of softening to the utmost the evils of their unhappy condition.

Immediately on leaving Mourzouk, the travellers entered on that continuous desert, which they were to spend upwards of three months in crossing. For some time, they were relieved



by finding, though at vast distances, little towns situated in *oases*, or watered valleys, the high palm-trees of which were eagerly looked to by the caravan as landmarks. As they advanced, however, these became constantly more 'few and far between,' till, after Bilma, there occurred a tract utterly desolate, which it required thirteen days to cross.

This route bisects the two peculiar native tribes who tenant the desert, the Tibboo and the Tuarick. They appear to be races of high antiquity, and have a language peculiar to themselves. The Tuarick have even an alphabet, which they write, not on books or parchment, but on the dark rocks which, with intervening sands, cover the surface of their territory. Both carry on a system of petty trade and petty plunder against each other, the caravans, and the bordering countries. The Tuarick are of rougher front, and when they invade the country of the Tibboo, its inhabitants find safety only in mounting to the top of the perpendicular rocks, beneath which all their villages are built. In domestic life, they are said to be manly, frank, and hospitable. The fair sex are not here excessively black; and Major Denham, who takes always the strictest cognizance of this particular, considered the features of several as very pleasing, even under the African ornaments of coral stuck in the nose, and faces streaming with oil. They are not confined and degraded as in most other Negro countries; and though gay, and with all the African love of dancing, do not seem much to abuse this liberty.

The travellers had not proceeded far, before an appalling spectacle presented itself. Even within the limits of Fezzan, the ground began to be strewed with human skeletons. From sixty to a hundred were passed in a day; and about the wells of El Hammar, they were found lying in countless multitudes. Major Denham was once roused from a reverie by the sound of two of them crackling beneath his horse's feet. He somewhat favours the common idea of caravans being buried under the drifting sand; but none of his facts seem to controvert the opinion of Browne, that these victims have perished merely through want and fatigue, and the sand insensibly collected over them. So long a march over these burning deserts, where food often becomes scanty, and where Boo-Khaloom considered himself generous in allowing one regular draught of water in the day, seems quite sufficient to account for these calamitous issues.

One of the most remarkable features of the desert, consists in the vast quantity of saline particles with which it is every where impregnated. On many of the plains, the earth was as

it were glazed or frozen over with salt; the clods were full of cracks, and so hard as to make it nearly impossible to break them. In other places, the salt was beautifully crystallized, like the finest frost-work. Near Bilma, wherever a spring could be found, they had only to dig a little pond to receive it; and the water, though quite fresh, soon became strongly impregnated with the mineral. This salt, and particularly a pure transparent kind found in the neighbouring lakes, forms the basis of a very extensive commerce with Soudan, from which the Bilma Tibboo in vain attempt to exclude their powerful neighbours the Tuarick.

In the total solitude which succeeded Bilma, a structure occurs similar to that of Balouchistan; loose hills of sand, perpendicular on one side, and which the camels glide down, being kept steady by the rider laying his whole weight on the tail. Among this ocean of sand, dark sand-stone ridges rear their heads, and afford landmarks by which the caravans guide their course. 'Tremendously dreary are these marches: as far as the eye can reach, billows of sand bound the prospect. On seeing the solitary foot-passenger of the *kafila*, with his water-cask in his hand, and bag of zumeeta on his head, sink at a distance beneath the slope of one of these, as he plods his way alone, hoping to gain a few paces in his long day's work, by not following the track of the camels, one trembles for his safety.' Major Denham suffered severely, though mounted on a fine Arabian horse, which, besides performing well its appropriate functions, served moreover the function of a *parasol*, standing fixed for hours in one position, while his master, stretched beneath him, was sheltered from the burning rays of the sun.

After a fortnight's travelling through this scene of utter dreariness, the travellers were at length greeted by some symptoms of vegetable life. There appeared scattered clumps of herbage, and some stunted shrubs, on the leaves of which the camels feasted; herds of gazelles crossed their path, and the footsteps of the ostrich were traced. This tract is occupied by the Gunda Tibboo, who live entirely on camels' milk, with a very little millet. Even the horses are fed with milk only, upon which food they become fat and active. Boo-Khaloom waited on 'the Black Bird,' as the hereditary Sheikh of the Gundas chose to design himself, and presented him with some coarse scarlet cloth, and a tawdry silk robe. This apparel being the finest ever worn by 'the Black Bird,' threw him into an ecstasy of delight, which he testified by loud shouts, and high leaps into the air. The Tibboo were here on the

watch for whatever straggled from the caravan. Even a favourite dog was found eaten, and only the bones left; and a courier having been sent forward, rather handsomely equipped, to announce their approach to the Sultan of Bornou, they came upon him two days after, entirely stripped, and tied naked to a tree. Yet there appears little ground for Boo-Khaloom's rage on these occasions, when we find his own followers beginning the regular plunder of these poor wanderers of the desert, and even sending out scouts to bring tidings where any nest of them might lie concealed. As they approached any town or village, the inhabitants were seen on the plain beyond, driving before them in furious haste their cattle and all their effects. Boo-Khaloom appears to have been a good deal ashamed of these transactions. and, at the instigation of Major Denham, enforced restitution to a great extent; but it appears very doubtful if, without this stimulus, his conscience would have been so tender on a point which evidently entered into the regular system of caravan proceedings.

The country now rapidly improved, and was adorned with beautiful groves; and at length they reached Lari, a considerable town in the territory of Kanem. This formed an important era; for, from the rising ground on which Lari stood, they discovered 'the great lake Tchad, glowing with the golden rays of the sun in its strength.' Major Denham speedily hastened to view this greatest of the interior African waters.

'By sun-rise I was on the borders of the lake, armed for the destruction of the multitude of birds, who, all unconscious of my purpose, seemed as it were to welcome our arrival. Flocks of geese and wild ducks, of a most beautiful plumage, were quietly feeding at within half pistol shot of where I stood; and not being a very keen or inhuman sportsman, for the terms appear to me to be synonymous, my purpose of deadly warfare was almost shaken. As I moved towards them, they only changed their places a little to the right or left, and appeared to have no idea of the hostility of my intentions. All this was really so new, that I hesitated to abuse the confidence with which they regarded me, and very quietly sat down to contemplate the scene before me. Pelicans, cranes, four or five feet in height, grey, variegated, and white, were scarcely so many yards from my side, and a bird, between a snipe and a woodcock, resembling both and larger than either; immense spoonbills of a snowy whiteness, widgeon, teal, yellow-legged plover, and a hundred species of (to me at least) unknown water-fowl, were sporting before me; and it was long before I could disturb the tranquillity of the dwellers on these waters by firing a gun.

'The soil near the edges of the lake was a firm dark mud; and, in proof of the great overflowings and recedings of the waters, even in this advanced dry season, the stalks of the gussub, of the preced-

ing year, were standing in the lake, more than forty yards from the shore. The water is sweet and pleasant, and abounds with fish. ' pp. 46—47.

After eight days travelling along the western shore of the lake, they came to another important feature—the Yeou, a very considerable stream, flowing from the west, and falling into the Tchad. It was about fifty yards broad, and two canoes lay on the bank, to ferry over goods and passengers. These vessels, though large, were very rudely constructed, of planks fastened together with cords. They received twenty or thirty persons, while the camels and horses swam with their heads made fast to the boats. Every one of the Arabs said this was the Nile.

Three days after, the caravan arrived at Kouka, the capital, or at least the residence of the reigning sovereign of Bornou; and they were introduced at once into all the pomp of a Central African court.

' Our accounts had been so contradictory of the state of this country, that no opinion could be formed as to the real condition or the numbers of its inhabitants. We had been told that the sheikh's soldiers were a few ragged negroes armed with spears, who lived upon the plunder of the Black Kaffir countries, by which he was surrounded, and which he was enabled to subdue by the assistance of a few Arabs who were in his service; and again, we had been assured that his forces were not only numerous, but to a certain degree well trained. The degree of credit which might be attached to these reports was nearly balanced in the scales of probability; and we advanced towards the town of Kouka in a most interesting state of uncertainty, whether we should find its chief at the head of thousands, or be received by him under a tree, surrounded by a few naked slaves.

' These doubts, however, were quickly removed. I had ridden on a short distance in front of Boo-Khaloom, with his train of Arabs, all mounted, and dressed out in their best apparel; and, from the thickness of the trees, soon lost sight of them, fancying that the road could not be mistaken. I rode still onwards, and on approaching a spot less thickly planted, was not a little surprised to see in front of me a body of several thousand cavalry drawn up in line, and extending right and left quite as far as I could see; and, checking my horse, I awaited the arrival of my party, under the shade of a wide-spreading acacia. The Bornou troops remained quite steady, without noise or confusion; and a few horsemen, who were moving about in front giving directions, were the only persons out of the ranks. On the Arabs appearing in sight, a shout, or yell, was given by the sheikh's people, which rent the air: a blast was blown from their rude instruments of music equally loud, and they moved on to meet Boo-Khaloom and his Arabs. There was an appearance of tact and management in their movements which astonished me; three

separate small bodies, from the centre and each flank, kept charging rapidly towards us, to within a few feet of our horses' heads, without checking the speed of their own until the moment of their halt, while the whole body moved onwards. These parties were mounted on small but very perfect horses, who stopped, and wheeled from their utmost speed with great precision and expertness, shaking their spears over their heads, exclaiming, "*Barca ! barca ! Alla hiakkum cha, alla cheraga !*—Blessing ! blessing ! Sons of your country ! Sons of your country !" and returning quickly to the front of the body, in order to repeat the charge. While all this was going on, they closed in their right and left flanks, and surrounded the little body of Arab warriors so completely, as to give the compliment of welcoming them very much the appearance of a declaration of their contempt for their weakness. I am quite sure this was premeditated ; we were all so closely pressed as to be nearly smothered, and in some danger from the crowding of the horses and clashing of the spears. Moving on was impossible ; and we therefore came to a full stop : our chief was much enraged, but it was all to no purpose, he was only answered by shrieks of " Welcome ! " and spears most unpleasantly rattled over our heads expressive of the same feeling. This annoyance was not however of long duration ; Barca Gana, the sheikh's first general, a negro of a noble aspect, clothed in a figured silk robe, and mounted on a beautiful Mandara horse, made his appearance ; and, after a little delay, the rear was cleared of those who had pressed in upon us, and we moved on, although but very slowly, from the frequent impediment thrown in our way by these wild equestrians.

The Sheikh's negroes, as they were called, meaning the black chiefs and favourites, all raised to that rank by some deed of bravery, were habited in coats of mail composed of iron chain, which covered them from the throat to the knees, dividing behind, and coming on each side of the horse : some of them had helmets, or rather skull-caps, of the same metal, with chin-pieces, all sufficiently strong to ward off the shock of a spear. Their horses heads were also defended by plates of iron, brass, and silver, just leaving sufficient room for the eyes of the animal.

At length, on arriving at the gate of the town, ourselves, Boo-Khaloom, and about a dozen of his followers, were alone allowed to enter the gates ; and we proceeded along a wide street completely lined with spearmen on foot, with cavalry in front of them, to the door of the sheikh's residence. Here the horsemen were formed up three deep, and we came to a stand : some of the chief attendants came out, and after a great many "*Barca's ! Barca's !*" retired, when others performed the same ceremony. We were now again left sitting on our horses in the sun : Boo-Khaloom began to lose all patience, and swore by the bashaw's head, that he would return to the tents if he was not immediately admitted ; he got, however, no satisfaction but a motion of the hand from one of the chiefs, meaning

"wait patiently;" and I whispered to him the necessity of obeying, as we were hemmed in on all sides, and to retire without permission would have been as difficult as to advance. Barca Gana now again appeared, and made a sign that Boo-Khaloom should dismount: we were about to follow his example, when an intimation that Boo-Khaloom was alone to be admitted again fixed us to our saddles. Another half hour at least passed without any news from the interior of the building; when the gates opened, and the four Englishmen only were called for, and we advanced to the skiffa (entrance.) Here we were stopped most unceremoniously by the black guards in waiting, and were allowed, one by one only, to ascend a staircase; at the top of which we were again brought to a stand by crossed spears, and the open flat hand of a negro laid upon our breast. Boo-Khaloom came from the inner chamber, and asked "If we were prepared to salute the sheikh as we did the bashaw?" We replied, "Certainly;" which was merely an inclination of the head, and laying the right hand on the heart. He advised our laying our hands also on our heads, but we replied, "the thing was impossible! we had but one manner of salutation for any body, except our own sovereign."

Another parley now took place, but in a minute or two he returned, and we were ushered into the presence of this Sheikh of Spears. We found him in a small dark room, sitting on a carpet, plainly dressed in a blue robe of Soudan, and a shawl turban. Two negroes were on each side of him, armed with pistols, and on his carpet lay a brace of these instruments. Fire-arms were hanging in different parts of the room, presents from the bashaw and Mustapha L'Achmar, the sultan of Fezzan, which are here considered as invaluable. His personal appearance was prepossessing, apparently not more than forty-five or forty-six, with an expressive countenance, and a benevolent smile. We delivered our letter from the bashaw; and after he had read it, he inquired "what was our object in coming?" We answered, "to see the country merely, and to give an account of its inhabitants, produce, and appearance; as our sultan was desirous of knowing every part of the globe." His reply was, "that we were welcome! and whatever he could show us would give him pleasure; that he had ordered huts to be built for us in the town; and that we might then go, accompanied by one of his people, to see them; and that when we were recovered from the fatigue of our long journey, he would be happy to see us." With this we took our leave. pp. 62-66.

Let us now take a general view of the kingdom of Bornou, surveyed for the first time by an European eye. Major Denham assigns to it five degrees of latitude and six of longitude; but this is a very wide and loose estimate, including every territory to which it makes any sort of pretension. It is directly inconsistent, indeed, with his own statement of the boundaries, which will allow only about two hundred miles in each direction. The Tchad, which forms the chief physical feature,

may be about two hundred miles in length, and 150 in breadth. It thus forms one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world, though it cannot rival the mighty inland seas of Asia. Its dimensions vary in an extraordinary manner according to the season. An extent of many miles, usually dry, is submerged during the rains. This inundated tract, covered with impenetrable thickets, and with rank grass twice the human height, is unfit for the residence of men, and becomes a huge den of wild beasts; elephants of enormous dimensions, beneath whose reclining bodies large shrubs, and even young trees were seen crushed; lions, panthers, leopards, large flocks of hyænas, and snakes of monstrous bulk. It is a disastrous era when the returning waters dislodge these monsters of the wood, and drive them to seek their prey among the habitations of men. At this period travellers, and the persons employed in watching the harvests, often fall victims; nay, the hyænas have been known to carry walled towns by storm, and devour the herds which had been driven into them for shelter.

This tract excepted, the soil of Bornou, watered by the tropical rains, and often partially inundated, is very fertile. On being scratched with a hoe by the female slaves, and the seed scattered rather than sown, it yields very considerable crops. The population is reckoned at five millions. There are cities of from ten to thirty thousand inhabitants, chiefly along the shores of the lake, besides numerous walled towns. The markets present a most crowded scene, the principal one at Angornou being said to attract no less than a hundred thousand visitors. Yet there is perhaps no instance of a people so considerable, and with a population so dense, who have remained so entirely strangers to all the refined arts, and to every form of intellectual existence. We should be very little disposed to estimate a nation by its progress in the culinary art; yet when those who, strangers to any higher enjoyment, make no attempts to improve even this, there seems fair ground to infer a peculiar mental sluggishness. In this fine climate, there is not a vegetable raised except the onion, and that very sparingly; there is not a fruit, except a few limes in the garden of the Sheikh. They have neither bread, the most solid and valuable basis of human food, nor salt, regarded every where else as a necessary condiment. Instead of the finer grains of wheat or rice, they raise gussub, a species of small grain, or rather seed, which, being boiled to a paste, and melted fat poured over it, the *ne plus ultra* of Bornou cookery is produced. Working in iron, among nations whose chiefs at least are martial, has usually got a start beyond other arts. But when Hillman the English carpenter

undertook to repair a small field-piece, and obtained for that purpose the assistance of the best Bornou workmen, he was kept in a state of perpetual agony by the clumsiness with which they handled their tools. The only manufacture in which they have attained to any kind of excellence, is that of cotton cloth dyed blue with their fine indigo, the tobes or pieces of which are the current coin of the realm; and yet in this staple fabric of Central Africa, they are much excelled both by the people of Soudan, and those to the south. The bare necessities of life, however, exist in abundance. The cattle are bred in vast herds by an Arab tribe called Shouaas, who have transported into Bornou all the pastoral habits of their nation. They are here described as deceitful, arrogant, and cunning, pretending to a gift of prophecy, and bearing a great resemblance to gypsies: But this impression was probably derived from what was observed near the great towns; for, elsewhere, we shall find a much more favourable picture drawn of them. The produce of their farms is driven to town on bullocks, upon the top of which sits the owner, guiding the animal by a leather thong passed through the nose.

‘ Sometimes the daughter or the wife of a rich Shouaa will be mounted on her particular bullock, and precede the loaded animals; extravagantly adorned with amber, silver rings, coral, and all sorts of finery, her hair streaming with fat, a black rim of *kohol*, at least an inch wide, round each of her eyes, and I may say, arrayed for conquest at the crowded market. Carpets or tobes are then spread on her clumsy palfrey: she sits *jambe deçà jambe delà*, and with considerable grace guides her animal by his nose. Notwithstanding the peacableness of his nature, her vanity still enables her to torture him into something like caperings and curvetings.’ p. 321.

The Bornouese are characterised by simplicity, good nature, and ugliness. They have in excess the thick lips, face sloping backwards, and other characteristics of the negro. Almost their only amusements are wrestling and gaming. The former is performed like the feats of the Roman gladiators, and with equal fury, by slaves from the neighbouring countries of Begharmi and Musgouy. Their masters exhibit them, as our jockies do their race-horses, for the pride of victory. A powerful wrestling slave will sell at a very high price, but a defeat being here never forgotten, will cause his value in one day to fall from a hundred dollars to four or five. Their game is a species of rude chess, played with beans and holes in the sand, and at which they are very skilful. Of their literary and intellectual state, nothing is said, and we presume it is a total blank. There does not appear to be any reading, even of the Koran, unless among a very few of the great men, and of professed fighis or doctors. The Sheikh



of Bornou indeed is famed over Africa as ‘an eminent writer ;’ but as his works consist only of *saphies*, or charms, destined to blunt the weapons of his enemies, and secure victory to himself, they cannot tend much to illuminate the public mind. The principle of speculative curiosity is one to which they are not only strangers, but which they cannot at all conceive as capable of swaying the human mind. When the travellers stated this as their motive for visiting Africa, they were met by universal scepticism. Even the Sheikh of Bornou, a man of enlarged and active mind, assured them that he alone, of all his subjects, believed what they said,—and he, only from having found them always men of their word, not from any power he had of viewing this as a conceivable principle of conduct.

When the first accounts of Bornou were transmitted to the Association, that empire had acquired a decided predominance in Central Africa ; and Kassina, before accounted the first, had sunk into a secondary state. A complete reaction has lately been produced by the nation, or race of the Felatahs, whose capital is situated far to the west, at Sackatoo. They have completely overrun both Kassina and Bornou, and in the latter especially committed most dreadful ravages. They reduced to ashes the capital, and many of the principal towns, carrying all the inhabitants into slavery. The present Sheikh, however, then a mere private individual in the neighbouring territory of Kanem, dared to raise the fallen standard. Uniting to military and political talents the power of acting on the national superstition, he pretended a celestial vision, hoisted the green flag of the prophet, and assumed the sole title of the ‘ Servant of God.’ The people flocked round him in crowds, and, being fortunate in his first exploits, he in ten months drove the Felatahs out of Bornou. They have not since reentered it, nor has El Kanemy, as he is called, invaded Soudan. A sort of dormant hostility, however, still prevails between the two parties. The Sheikh has directed his arms chiefly against the Begharmis, a warlike people on the other side of the lake, whom he boasts of having conquered ; yet, in all the transactions witnessed by the mission, the Begharmis appeared as the assailants, though on one occasion most completely beaten.

The force of Bornou Proper consists almost entirely of cavalry, mounted on small but active horses, which they manage with a skill equal to that of the Moors. Many of them are defended by coats of mail composed of iron chains, by helmets, and by metal-plates enclosing their horses’ heads. They would form one of the finest bodies of cavalry in the world, if

they could only face an enemy ; but as this is a faculty of which they are totally destitute, they serve for little more than to swell the apparent pomp of battle. Only, after the victory has been completely decided, and all the enemies' backs are turned, the Bornou horse at length take the field, and show considerable activity in cutting down the fugitives. The fighting part of the army consists of the Sheikh's old countrymen, the Kanemboo spearmen, with such of the Arabs, Tuaricks, and other hardy inhabitants of the desert, as the hope of plunder can attract to his standard.

The Sheikh, though his sway was now paramount, very prudently contented himself with the reality of power. The ostensible dignity of Sultan he conferred upon a member of the ancient royal family, whom the people would not have willingly seen entirely passed over, and whom he established in empty pomp at New Birnie. The fashions of courts are often little under the guidance either of nature or taste ; nor has Europe in this respect always ground to reproach the rest of the world. But there is probably no court of which the taste is so absurd, grotesque, or preposterous, as that of Bornou. A huge belly is considered the primary requisite of a fine gentleman, or of one fit to wait on the Sultan ; and where feeding and cramming will not produce this elegant feature, the part is cushioned and stuffed out till it appears to possess the required dimension. The honour attached to this form must arise seemingly from its being considered as a type of abundance and luxury. Over this unwieldy bulk are then thrown ten or twelve successive robes of various and rich materials. The head, too, is covered with fold over fold, till there is seen only a small part of the face, which, according to the nicest taste, ought to appear entirely on one side. Over all are numberless charms enclosed in green leather cases, covering their clothes, horses and arms. In this attire these champions actually take the field ; but the idea of such unwieldy hogsheads acting any part in battle, appeared to the mission utterly ridiculous. Indeed, the Sultan, who ought to be more protuberant, and buried under a greater quantity of cloth than any of his chiefs, is subject to the convenient etiquette of never fighting. When his army is routed, and he cannot escape, he seats himself in state under a tree, and tranquilly awaits the stroke of the enemy.

The government of the Sheikh appears to be completely absolute. Justice is rigidly administered. Causes are first tried by the Cady, from whom an appeal lies to him. Major Denham praises much this prince for having turned all his conquests to the benefit of morality, by his strict enforcement of

the Mahommedan law. On finding, however, some of the points on which the main stress is laid, we must demur to this panegyric. One of the most deadly is the tasting a drop of water, under this burning sun, before evening, so long as the Rhamadan lasts. As soon as the prince, by means of numerous spies, learns that such an enormity has been committed, he subjects the criminal to four hundred lashes with a thong of hippopotamus's hide, which are usually followed in a few hours by a death of torture. At the same time, a man who had stolen ten camels was punished only by a hundred lashes from a milder instrument. The rigour of the Sheikh was also peculiarly directed against those failures in the fair sex, of which disgrace and loss of caste are the proper penalty. Death, with ignominy, was that which he awarded; and at one time, during the residence of the mission, sixty of these culprits were brought before him by his spies, of whom five were condemned to be hanged, and four were flogged with such severity, that two expired under the lash. This outrageous virtue, which we can scarcely forbear, with Major Denham, to pronounce diabolical, marks a strange anomaly in Mahometan morals. This merciless vindicator of female virtue deemed himself quite holy and pure, while he maintained a seraglio of upwards of a hundred wives and concubines, guarded by numerous eunuchs! After all, justice seems tolerably administered under the Sheikh, persons and property secured, and commerce considerably extending.

The bigotry of the ruling sovereign seems fully shared by the people, both of this and the neighbouring countries. Introduced as friends of Boo-Khaloom, the English met at first a cordial reception; but it was impossible to prevent the question being soon asked, to what Mahometan sect they belonged? Boo-Khaloom replied, that they were unfortunate persons; they believed not in 'the book,' and did not *sully* five times a day. They had indeed a book of their own, in which they blindly believed, but in it nothing was said of Saidna Mahomet. A deep groan then burst from all the surrounding audience, and the strangers were viewed only with cold and averted glances. Boo-Khaloom endeavoured to retrieve matters by saying, that their nation was powerful, very powerful; that it was rich, very rich. This only drew from the most devout person present, the ejaculation, 'The Lord send all their riches into the hands of true Mussulmen!' to which the rest echoed, 'Amen.' The mission had a mortifying proof of this, in the case of a man accused of theft, and convicted by the clearest evidence, till he challenged the principal witness as having eaten the bread of the unbelievers. The witness could not deny the fact; yet

solemnly protested that no one present could surpass him in abhorrence of the Christians; but that, being in a state of starvation, he had been compelled 'by strong necessity's supreme command,' to enter their service for two or three weeks. All his pleas, however, were overruled; his evidence was set aside, and the prisoner acquitted.

Boo-Khaloom had brought with him an extensive assortment of goods, for which he did not find a sufficient demand in the market of Bornou. His own anxious wish seems to have been, to proceed into Soudan, and make this a mere peaceable and commercial expedition. His followers, however, were dazzled by proposals held out of expeditions to the south, the result of which was to be the bringing in of an immense body of slaves, by far the most precious booty in their eyes. The malecontent part of the caravan was reinforced by his own brother, and their feuds were fomented by the Sheikh, who had views of his own to serve. Boo-Khaloom at last felt, that he could not on any other terms return with *cclat* to Fezzan, where his enemy, the Sultan, would derive a vast advantage, from being able to reproach him with having neglected to bring so copious an influx of wealth. Under these influences, the Arab chief allowed his better judgment to be overpowered, and agreed to form a *aghraz-zie*, or slave-hunt, into the mountains of Mandara. The Sheikh sent with him a large body of cavalry, under Barca Gana, who, originally a purchased slave from Soudan, had been raised to the rank of commander-in-chief by the merits of matchless bodily strength and prowess, the latter greatly reinforced by the belief of his possessing a charm that rendered him invulnerable.

The Sheikh prohibited Major Denham from accompanying this *foray*, alleging that he himself was responsible for his safety to the Bashaw, and could not expose him to its dangers, which he was secretly conscious might be very great. The Major, however, fired with zeal for discovery, set off without leave, when the Sheikh sent a slave to attend him, and placed him under the especial care of Barca Gana. They passed by several large towns, along a route which continually ascended, till they came in view of a new and grand feature of African geography, the kingdom and mountains of Mandara. The former consists of a fine valley, in which are situated eight large, and a number of smaller towns. This valley, and even the Mandara capital, are immediately overhung by the mountains, whose recesses are tenanted by a numerous and barbarous race, comprehended under the general name of Kerdies or Pagans. They are hence considered as lawful prey; and a Kerdy district to carry it

captivity, was now the universal cry of the Arabs. The dwellings of these people were everywhere seen in clusters on the sides, and even at the tops of the hills, which immediately overlook the Mandara capital. 'The fires which were visible in the different nests of these unfortunates, threw a glare upon the bold peaks and blunt promontories of granite rock by which they were surrounded, and produced a picturesque and somewhat awful appearance.' The peaks immediately adjoining were not above 2,500 feet high; but others that were seen in the distance to the south, towered evidently to a much greater height. One peak, said to be thirty-five miles distant, had a most alpine character, and much resembled the *aiguilles* of Mont Blanc, as seen from the *Mer de Glace*. They were asserted to extend southward for two months' journey, and in some places to be ten times as high as those which rose above the plain of Mandara. They were called large, large *moon* mountains; so that this classic name is even here applied to the central range of Africa. The natives are numerous; they paint their bodies, cover themselves with the skins of wild beasts, and subsist chiefly on fruits, honey, and the fish drawn from large lakes.

To these unfortunate mountaineers the view of the Arab tents in the valley beneath was a most appalling spectacle. They knew well the purpose; and each thought only how to prevent the storm from bursting on his own head. Parties were seen coming down with leopard skins, honey, and slaves, as presents or peace-offerings to the Sultan. As the tidings spread, there appeared a detachment of the people of Musgow, a more distant and uncouth race. They came mounted on little fiery steeds, covered only with the skin of a goat or leopard, and having round their neck long strings of the teeth of their enemies. They brought two hundred slaves; and, on being admitted to the Royal presence, threw themselves on the ground, cast sand on their heads, and uttered the most piteous cries. The Sultan began to observe to Boo-Khaloom, that really these people appeared extremely tractable, and that probably the mere dread of the Arab arms would turn their hearts to the faith of the Prophet. Boo-Khaloom listened with extreme coldness to these hopes, and expressed to Major Denham his indignant conviction, that nothing was less desired by this devout Mussulman than such an actual conversion, which would divest him of the right of driving this unfortunate race by thousands to the markets of Kano and Bornou. In fact, the Sultan had quite other views. United with Bornou, in fear and enmity to the Felatahs, he wished to engage the Arabs to aid in the attack of some strong posts which they held

in his neighbourhood. He was seconded by all the Bornouese influence. Besides other motives, Major Denham suspects that the Sheikh had been not a little mortified by the slighting manner in which the Arab chief, while treating of the southern expedition, had talked of black troops armed only with spears; two grounds of contempt which involved equally his own people; and that he was not unwilling that Boo-Khaloom should have a trial of the most formidable of negro weapons, the poisoned arrows of the Felatahs. Boo-Khaloom long stood out; but at length his evil genius again prevailed. As he came out to order the movement of his followers, Major Denham asked him if all went well? to which he merely answered, with a troubled visage, 'God grant it may be so!' and hurried on.

On leaving Mora the capital, they entered at once, through a rugged pass, into the heart of that mass of mountains, whose apparently interminable chain spread before them in rugged magnificence, with clustering villages on their stony sides. In the intervening valleys were the first spots seen in Africa where nature seemed at all to have revelled in giving life to the vegetable kingdom; the verdure was bright and luxuriant, and the trunks of the trees almost hid by the profusion of flowering parasitical plants which clung round them. On the following day they came in view of the Felatah town of Dirkuallah. The attack was made by Boo-Khaloom and his Arabs, supported only by Barca Gana and about a hundred of his picked chiefs; the rest, as usual, hung behind, awaiting the alternative either of flight or pursuit, as the issue might dictate. The Arabs gallantly carried two successive posts, when they came to a third, enclosed between hills, and defended by a strong palisade. In half an hour these defences were carried, the town was entered, and the Felatahs driven up the sides of the hills. It was thought, had the cavalry now pushed forward, that the defeat would have been signal; but as some arrows continued to whiz through the air, that prudent body deemed it still advisable to hold itself ensconced behind the hills on the opposite side of the stream. The Felatahs, seeing the small number with whom they had to contend, now rallied; reinforcements joined them; and the women behind, like those of the ancient Germans, cheered them to the combat, supplied continually fresh arrows, and even assisted in rolling down fragments of rock upon the enemy. They now not only stood their ground, but began to attack in their turn, and to pour in clouds of those fatal arrows, which, wherever they struck, destined the victim soon to become a blackened corpse, with blood gushing from every orifice. The condition of the Arabs soon became desperate; the arrows fell

thick, piercing both horses and riders; and Major Bonham saw one man drop, who had five sticking in his head alone. At length the horse of Boo-Khaleem, and then himself, received wounds destined soon to be mortal. As the Arabs began to give way, the Felatah horse dashed in upon them; while all the chivalry of Bornou and Mandara were seen spurring their steeds to the most rapid flight. The Major's attention, however, was now necessarily engrossed by his personal situation.

I now for the first time, as I saw Barca Gana on a fresh horse, lamented my own folly in so exposing myself, badly prepared as I was for accidents. If either of my horse's wounds were from poisoned arrows, I felt that nothing could save me: however there was not much time for reflection; we instantly became a flying mass, and plunged, in the greatest disorder, into that wood we had but a few hours before moved through with order, and very different feelings. I had got a little to the westward of Barca Gana, in the confusion which took place on our passing the ravine which had been left just in our rear, and where upwards of one hundred of the Bornowy were speared by the Felatahs, and was following at a round gallop the steps of one of the Mandara eunuchs, who, I observed, kept a good look out, his head being constantly turned over his left shoulder, with a face expressive of the greatest dismay—when the cries behind, of the Felatah horse pursuing, made us both quicken our paces. The spur, however, had the effect of incapacitating my beast altogether, as the arrow, I found afterwards, had reached the shoulder-bone, and in passing over some rough ground, he stumbled and fell. Almost before I was on my legs, the Felatahs were upon me; I had, however, kept hold of the bridle, and seizing a pistol from the holsters, I presented it at two of these ferocious savages, who were pressing me with their spears: they instantly went off; but another who came on me more boldly, just as I was endeavouring to mount, received the contents somewhere in his left shoulder, and again I was enabled to place my foot in the stirrup. Remounted, I again pushed my retreat; I had not, however, proceeded many hundred yards, when my horse again came down, with such violence as to throw me against a tree at a considerable distance; and, alarmed at the horses behind him, he quickly got up and escaped, leaving me on foot and unarmed.

The eunuch and his four followers were here butchered, after a very slight resistance, and stripped within a few yards of me: their cries were dreadful; and even now the feelings of that moment are fresh in my memory. My hopes of life were too faint to deserve the name. I was almost instantly surrounded; and incapable of making the least resistance, as I was unarmed—was as speedily stripped; and whilst attempting first to save my shirt and then my trowsers, I was thrown on the ground. My pursuers made several thrusts at me.

with their spears, that badly wounded my hands in two places, and slightly my body, just under my ribs on the right side. Indeed, I saw nothing before me but the same cruel death I had seen unmercifully inflicted on the few who had fallen into the power of those who now had possession of me; and they were only prevented from murdering me, in the first instance, I am persuaded, by the fear of injuring the value of my clothes, which appeared to them a rich booty—but it was otherwise ordained.

‘ My shirt was now absolutely torn off my back, and I was left perfectly naked. When my plunderers began to quarrel for the spoil, the idea of escape came like lightning across my mind, and without a moment’s hesitation or reflection I crept under the belly of the horse nearest me, and started as fast as my legs could carry me for the thickest part of the wood. Two of the Felatahs followed, and I ran on to the eastward, knowing that our stragglers would be in that direction, but still almost as much afraid of friends as foes. My pursuers gained on me, for the prickly underwood not only obstructed my passage, but tore my flesh miserably; and the delight with which I saw a mountain-stream gliding along at the bottom of a deep ravine, cannot be imagined. My strength had almost left me, and I seized the young branches issuing from the stump of a large tree which overhung the ravine, for the purpose of letting myself down into the water, as the sides were precipitous, when, under my hand, as the branch yielded to the weight of my body, a large liffa, the worst kind of serpent this country produces, rose from its coil, as if in the very act of striking. I was horror struck, and deprived for a moment of all recollection—the branch slipped from my hand, and I tumbled headlong into the water beneath; this shock, however, revived me, and with three strokes of my arms I reached the opposite bank, which, with difficulty, I crawled up; and then, for the first time, felt myself safe from my pursuers.

‘ I now saw horsemen through the trees, still farther to the east, and determined on reaching them, if possible, whether friends or enemies; and the feelings of gratitude and joy with which I recognised Barca Gana and Boo-Khaloom, with about six Arabs, although they also were pressed closely by a party of the Felatahs, was beyond description. The guns and pistols of the Arab sheikhs kept the Felatahs in check, and assisted in some measure the retreat of the footmen. I hailed them with all my might; but the noise and confusion which prevailed, from the cries of those who were falling under the Felatah spears, the cheers of the Arabs rallying and their enemies pursuing, would have drowned all attempts to make myself heard, had not Maramy, the sheikh’s negro, seen and known me at a distance. To this man I was indebted for my second escape; riding up to me, he assisted me to mount behind him, while the arrows whistled over our heads, and we then galloped off to the rear as fast as his wounded horse could carry us. After we had gone a mile or two, and the pursuit had something cooled, in consequence of all the



baggage having been abandoned to the enemy, Boo-Khaloom rode up to me, and desired one of the Arabs to cover me with a bournouse. This was a most welcome relief, for the burning sun had already begun to blister my neck and back, and gave me the greatest pain. Shortly after, the effects of the poisoned wound in his foot caused our excellent friend to breathe his last. Maramy exclaimed, "Look, look! Boo-Khaloom is dead!" I turned my head, almost as great an exertion as I was capable of, and saw him drop from the horse into the arms of his favourite Arab—he never spoke after. They said he had only swooned; there was no water, however, to revive him; and about an hour after, when we came to Makkeray, he was past the reach of restoratives.

About the time Boo-Khaloom dropped, Barca Gana ordered a slave to bring me a horse, from which he had just dismounted, being the third that had been wounded under him in the course of the day; his wound was in the chest. Maramy cried, "*Sudi rais!* do not mount him; he will die!" In a moment, for only a moment was given me, I decided on remaining with Maramy. Two Arabs, panting with fatigue, then seized the bridle, mounted, and pressed their retreat: in less than half an hour he fell to rise no more, and both the Arabs were butchered before they could recover themselves. Had we not now arrived at the water as we did, I do not think it possible that I could have supported the thirst by which I was consuming. I tried several times to speak in reply to Maramy's directions to hold tight, when we came to breaks or inequalities in the ground; but it was impossible; and a painful straining at the stomach and throat was the only effect produced by the effort.

On coming to the stream, the horses, with blood gushing from their nostrils, rushed into the shallow water, and, letting myself down from behind Maramy, I knelt down amongst them, and seemed to imbibe new life by the copious draughts of the muddy beverage which I swallowed. Of what followed I have no recollection: Maramy told me afterwards that I staggered across the stream, which was not above my hips, and fell down at the foot of a tree on the other side. About a quarter of an hour's halt took place here for the benefit of stragglers, and to tie poor Boo-Khaloom's body on a horse's back, at the end of which Maramy awoke me from a deep sleep, and I found my strength wonderfully increased: not so, however, our horse, for he had become stiff, and could scarcely move. As I learnt afterwards, a conversation had taken place about me while I slept, which rendered my obligations to Maramy still greater: he had reported to Barca Gana the state of his horse, and the impossibility of carrying me on, when the chief, irritated by his losses and defeat, as well as at my having refused his horse, by which means, he said, it had come by its death, replied, "Then leave him behind. By the head of the Prophet! believers enough have breathed their last to-day. What is there extraordinary in a Christian's death?" My old antagonist Malem Chadily replied, "No, God has preserved

him ; let us not forsake him ! " Maramy returned to the tree, and said " his heart told him what to do. " He awoke me, assisted me to mount, and we moved on as before. ' pp. 134-138.

Notwithstanding this hard apprenticeship to African warfare, no sooner was Major Denham recruited by a little rest, than he determined to accompany an expedition which the Sheikh was leading against the Mungars, a numerous and ill-subdued people to the west, who had broken into open rebellion. The route was interesting, as it would lead him to ascend the Yeou, which had as yet every appearance of being the long sought for Niger. The journey presented striking objects. The banks of the river, which had lately been the main theatre of the power and populousness of Bornou, presented a dreadful picture of the ravages of African warfare. After passing over the sites of thirty large towns, which the Felatahs had razed to the ground, carrying all the inhabitants into slavery, they found Old Birnie itself, the former capital, in the same condition. It had covered a space of five or six square miles ; but we are surprised the author could listen to such a palpable exaggeration as that of its having contained two hundred thousand inhabitants. It was now entirely desolate, as well as Gambarou, a favourite residence of the former Sultan ; and whose ruined edifices displayed a degree of elegance, not observable in any of the present royal residences. The banks of the river round these capitals, which had formerly been in a state of the highest cultivation, were now covered with labyrinths of thickets and brambles, and the meadows overgrown with wild plants. We know not why no effort should now be made to restore these spots to their natural fertility. One obstacle, unless vigorously checked, must arise from the constant predatory inroads of the Tuarick, on whose country all the tract borders. The inhabitants of the villages employ a singular mode of fortification. They dig a number of holes in the earth, so broad and deep, as to be sufficient to swallow up both a Tuarick and the camel on which he rides, receiving them at the bottom with a number of sharp pointed stakes, by which both are frequently killed on the spot. The top is so artfully overlaid with sods and grass, that the most watchful eye can scarcely discover it. Unfortunately, these African men-traps, like those of our English proprietary, may be equally fatal to the innocuous traveller. Our author was petrified with horror to find that he had several times been within a step or two of one of these living graves. His servant actually fell into one, but saved himself by an almost miraculous spring, and his mule only suffered.

At a large town called Kabshary, Major Denham joined the

army. He was much edified with the view of the Kanembou spearmen, who, to the number of nine thousand, formed the main fighting body. They fight almost naked, with only a skin round the middle. With a long shield they keep off the arrows of the enemy, and, slowly pressing forward in a mass, charge him with their spears. They keep a regular chain of picquets in front, and the sentinels pass the watch-cry every half hour along the line. Their shrill war-cry, and the dashing of their spears against their shields, exceeded any thing of sound that the mission had ever heard. They marched by tribes, and, as they passed in review before the Sheikh, crowded enthusiastically round him, kissing his feet, and even the stirrups of his saddle. From them and the Felatah archers, the Major draws the confirmation of an old maxim, that infantry is the body by which the fate of conquest is always determined. This conclusion seems hasty; it does not agree with the example of the Turks, Persians, and Tartars; and the plains of Soudan seem to afford full scope for the action of cavalry. The facts already stated respecting the Bornou cavalry, seem quite sufficient to decide, on special grounds, why *they* should not exercise any very powerful influence on the destinies of Africa. As the Mungoway fight, according to the Felatah system, with poisoned arrows, Major Denham felt a military desire to see the conflict between two bodies, both brave, and so differently equipped. He was disappointed, however, by the literary talents of the Sheikh, who fairly wrote down the enemy. He spent three successive nights in composing saphies and charms; the result of which was, that the enemy's spears were blunted, their arrows broken, their stoutest warriors seized with debility, or at least with fear. At length the opinion became prevalent, that to oppose a Sheikh of the Koran, who could perform such miracles, was altogether vain, and was moreover a sin. Chief after chief repaired to the camp, and gave in his submission. At length Malem Fanamy himself, the arch rebel, appeared. He entered the tent in miserable attire, threw himself on the ground, and was about to pour sand upon his head, in evident dread of immediate death. Instead of this, however, he was raised from the ground, covered with eight successive robes of the finest blue cloth, and his head wrapped in turbans from Egypt, till it was swelled to six times its natural size. By this able policy, the Sheikh conciliated a powerful and warlike tribe, whom ill treatment might have rooted in habits of turbulence and disaffection.

The mission had heard much of a great river, the Shary, falling from the south into the Tchad; and, after some difficul-

ties, they succeeded in obtaining permission to visit it and the kingdom of Loggun, situated on its banks. They were surprised at the magnitude of the stream, which they found near its junction, about half a mile broad, and running at the rate of between two and three miles an hour. They traced it upwards about forty miles, and saw it flowing, 'in great beauty and majesty, past the high walls of the capital of Loggun.' This country, now seen and heard of for the first time by Europeans, presented some features superior to any yet seen in Africa. Amid the furious warfare of the surrounding states, the Loggunese have steadily cultivated peace, which, by a skilful neutrality, they have been able to maintain. They are industrious, and work steadily at the loom, which is considered here as an occupation not degrading to freemen. The cloth, after being thrice steeped in a dye composed of their incomparable indigo, is laid on the trunk of a large tree, and beaten with wooden mallets, till it acquires the most brilliant gloss. They have a metallic currency, only indeed of iron; but none of their neighbours have any thing of the kind. They are described as a remarkably handsome and healthy race; the females, in particular, far more intelligent, and possessing a superior carriage and manner to those of any neighbouring nation. We are concerned to add, that, though much superior in these respects to the Bornou females, they fall below them in those virtues, which form the chief ornament of their sex. In particular, we find them charged with a total absence of common honesty. 'They examined every thing, even to the pockets of my trowsers; and more inquisitive ladies I never saw in any country. They begged for every thing, and nearly all attempted to steal something. When found out, they only laughed heartily, clapped their hands together, and exclaimed—Why, how sharp he is! Only think! Why, he caught us.' Yet, from these facts, it would perhaps be hasty to class all the ladies of Loggun as common thieves. The case was very *unique*—a white man, a being of a different species; his pockets filled with beads and coral, which rank, in this part of the world, with pearls and diamonds; in short, there seems to have been more of frolic, than of a downright determination to rob, in the whole transaction. In the course of their stay, some darker features were developed. There being two rival Sultans, father and son, Major Denham was solicited by both for poison to be employed against the other; and much surprise was expressed by the youth, when, in spite of the accompanying present of three beautiful black damsels, the petition was rejected. Loggun is very abundant in provisions of all kinds, the cattle being chiefly furnished by Shouaas, who inha-

bit in great numbers about the lake. Unhappily, it swarms with another species of life: 'Flies, bees, and mosquitos, with immense black toads, vie with each other in their peace-deströying powers.' The inhabitants dare not stir out for two or three hours in the day, without the hazard of their bites producing serious illness; children have been known to be killed by them. The only resource is, to make a fire of wet straw, and sit involved in the thick smoke it produces—if the remedy is not thought worse than the evil.

The end of this expedition was distressing. Mr Toole, an amiable young officer who accompanied Major Denham, died; and he himself was obliged to hasten out of the country, as the Begharmis had entered, and were ravaging it in all directions. He rejoined the Sheikh at Kouka, and marched with him against the invaders. A battle was fought; the Begharmis attacked very furiously, with two hundred chiefs at their head, and had at one time nearly surrounded Barca Gana's wing. The Sheikh had not had time to summon his Kanemboo spearmen, and could only muster a body of Arabs and some negroes, whom he had trained to the use of the musquet; yet with these he finally gained the victory; and so total was the route, that even the Bornou cavalry at length came forward, and did considerable execution in the pursuit.

Major Denham accompanied Barca Gana in another expedition against the La Sala Shouaas, a sort of amphibious pastoral people, inhabiting a number of verdant islands on the south-eastern shores of the lake. These islands are separated by channels so shallow, that the natives who understand them, can easily pass on horseback from one to the other; but as the bottom is full of mud and holes, the approach is very perilous to such as have not attained this knowledge. Barca Gana, having brought his troops to the shore of the lake, while the La Salas were drawn up on an island opposite, was disposed to pause. The view, however, of their fine herds and flocks, which were heard lowing and bleating on the opposite shores, roused the hunger and valour of the troops to an ungovernable pitch. There arose a general cry:—'What! shall we be so near them, and not eat them? This night these flocks and women shall be ours.' Animated by these noble sentiments, they insisted on being led into the water; and Barca Gana, though against his better judgment, was now foremost in the attack. They were soon, however, entangled in narrow passes, and began to flounder amid the holes and mud. As their ranks fell into confusion, the enemy poured on them clouds of missiles, and sent detachments of cavalry to attack them on all sides, and intercept their re-

treat. The route was complete; the invulnerable Barca Gana was pierced in the back through his chain armour, and four cotton robes, and was with difficulty carried off by his followers. We do not at all regret this victory of the La Salas, except in so far as it arrested our traveller in his design of making the circuit of the Tchad, and exploring Africa to the eastward.

This excursion introduces to us a race of Shouaa Arabs, called Dugganahs, who present their race, and even human nature, under a more pleasing aspect than it was seen in any other part of this long peregrination. They are entirely pastoral, and they live in plenty and patriarchal simplicity, often subsisting for months together, solely on the milk of their herds. They live in tents of leather formed into circular camps, and do not emigrate unless in case of necessity. They are distinguished by fine serious expressive countenances, large features, and long bushy beards. Tahr, their chief, might, it is said, have sat for the picture of one of the patriarchs. Their domestic affections appeared very strong. Tahr, after closely examining Major Denham as to the motives of so long an absence, concludes, 'And have you been three years from your home? Are not your eyes dimmed with straining to the north, where all your thoughts must ever be? Oh! you are men, men indeed. Why if my eyes do not see the wife and children of my heart for ten days, when they should be closed in sleep they are flowing with tears!'

During the whole night after the battle, the Dugganah women were heard singing dirges over their deceased husbands, in strains 'so musically piteous,' that it was impossible not to sympathise with them. The following address is certainly a curious combination of genuine kindness with interested coaxing.

'A girl sits down by your tent with a bowl of milk, a dark blue cotton wrapper tied round her waist, and a mantila of the same thrown over her head, with which she hides her face, yet leaves all her bust naked; she says, "A happy day to you! Your friend has brought you milk: you gave her something so handsome yesterday, she has not forgotten it. Oh! how her eyes ache to see all you have got in that wooden house," pointing to a trunk. "We have no fears now; we know you are good; and our eyes, which before could not look at you, now search after you always: they bid us beware of you, at first, for you were bad, very bad; but we know better now. How it pains us that you are so white!" p. 272.

Tahr was sounded as to the means of proceeding eastward; but he discouraged all thoughts of it, saying, 'Spears are now shining in the hands of the sons of Adam, and every man fears his neighbour.'

To complete the picture of this part of Africa, it will be ne-

cessary to mention the Biddoomah, a formidable people inhabiting certain large islands in the eastern part of the lake, much more in the interior than the La Salas. With the exception of the occupants of the Mandara mountains, Major Denham thought them the rudest beings he had ever beheld. They are Pagans, but worship a presiding power, who, they say, left them without riches or cattle, instead of which he gave strength and cunning, by which they might be enabled to take these good things from those who had them. This destination they zealously fulfil, carrying on a constant piratical war against Bornou, Beggarm, Kanem, and every state within their reach. Around all the shores of this vast expanse of water, there is not a spot which is for a moment secure from their inroads. The immediate vicinity of the capital is not excepted. Besides cattle, they carry off many of the inhabitants, for whom if possible they extort a ransom, otherwise they give them wives, and treat them tolerably. Their naval force is said to amount to nearly a thousand large canoes. The most enterprising of the Bornou sovereigns never seem to view it as a possible thing, either to reduce or check them. They say, 'The waters are theirs, what can we do?'

We now close Major Denham's narrative, which includes all the information obtained relative to Bornou and the adjoining regions. The volume, however, contains also the details of another equally important expedition, which Mr Clapperton and Dr Oudney with difficulty obtained permission to make westward into Soudan; and, though the story is not so varied or eventful, the value of the information obtained is fully equal. Their way at first lay partly along the banks of the Yeou, which were here found well cultivated, and crowded with towns and villages. Beyond the Bornou frontier, the route led along the territories of the Bedee, a rude people, who, protected by natural fastnesses, hold themselves still independent, and retain their Pagan rites, on which ground it is considered the first duty of all the neighbouring nations to enslave or kill them. It cannot be wondered at that the Bedees should do in like manner towards them: and hence this tract becomes extremely dangerous, especially as the caravans have a habit of considering all they meet as Bedees. The party experienced one day an extreme and remarkable cold. The water was covered with thin flakes of ice, and the leathern water-skins were frozen as hard as a board. This cold, which has excited a good deal of speculation, we should suppose must have been occasioned by the north wind which blew over the swampy, woody, and perhaps mountainous country, occupied by these Bedees.

On entering the territory now included in the empire of the Felatahs, the travellers found themselves at once in the midst of superior cultivation, and a superior people. The fields were covered with large crops of wheat, two of which were annually produced by irrigation, and the grain stored in large granaries raised on poles as a security from the insects. As this, however, was a conquered country, the ravages of Felatah warfare were visible, and whole quarters were seen in the towns, from which all the inhabitants had been carried into slavery. Katagum, a district which can muster 20,000 foot and 4000 horse, had been recently wrested from Bornou, and formed now the most westerly Felatah province. The Ycou was now seen in a new direction, coming from the south, out of a country said to be mountainous, and inhabited by rude tribes.

After a journey of about five weeks, Mr Clapperton entered Kano, the great emporium of Houssa, and indeed of Central Africa. It considerably disappointed expectation; and scarcely at first appeared like a city at all. They had advanced a quarter of a mile within the walls before even detached groupes of houses began to show themselves. However, as these walls are fifteen miles in circumference, it is not surprising that only a fourth part of the circuit should be occupied with houses. The inhabited part is divided into two by a large morass, on a spot in the midst of which, dry only during a part of the year, the great market is held. This market is the most frequented, and the best regulated in Africa. We doubt, however, whether the appointment of a Sheikh to regulate the prices be either necessary or useful. Such, however, is the confidence established, that it seems common to carry away packets of goods without opening them; and if any fraud afterwards appears, the packet is sent back, from whatever distance; and the dylala, or broker, is compelled to procure restitution of the purchase money. In the list of goods is given 'coarse writing paper, of French manufacture, brought from Barbary; scissors and knives, of native workmanship; crude antimony and tin, both the produce of the country; unwrought silk of a red colour, which they make into belts and slings, or weave in stripes into the finest cotton tobes; armlets and bracelets of brass; beads of glass, coral, and amber; finger rings of pewter, and a few silver trinkets, but none of gold; tobes, turkadees, and turban shawls; coarse woollen cloths of all colours; coarse calico; Moorish dresses; the cast-off gaudy garbs of the Mamelukes of Barbary; pieces of Egyptian linen, checked or striped with gold; sword blades from Malta, &c. &c. The market is crowded from sunrise to sunset every day, not excepting their Sabbath, which is kept on Friday.'



The slaves, when on sale, are dressed out, and seated in rows in two long sheds. The buyer is not only allowed the strictest inspection, but may return them in the course of three days, with or without reason assigned. The cowrie here, as in all the countries from Bornou to the Senegal, is the established medium of circulation. Mr Clapperton extols it much, as excluding forgery, and as equally suited to large and small sums, from the great dexterity with which the natives handle it; but really, to count over a thousand pieces, with whatever dexterity, every time one has to pay half a crown, is what we cannot reconcile to any idea of convenience.

Kano is reckoned to contain from 30,000 to 40,000 stationary inhabitants, independent of the vast crowds who repair thither, during the season of trade, from the remotest extremities of Africa. The great quantity of stagnant water enclosed within its walls renders it excessively unhealthy. Most of the Arab merchants who had resided for any time appeared rather like ghosts than men. The blind are also very numerous, and have a village set aside for them. The only public amusement here mentioned is one which bespeaks no very refined taste in the society of Kano. It is boxing, carried on with some science, but with such excessive fury, that a thorough *set-to* seldom terminates but in the death of one of the combatants. It appears that the fancy here exhibit for pay; and Captain Clapperton had the curiosity to hire a match, which attracted the whole population of Kano as spectators; however, he had a signal, by which he took care to stop proceedings as soon as they threatened to become serious.

From Kano the mission proceeded to Sackatoo, the present capital of the Felatah empire. About half way, by one route, though not visited till their return, is Kashna, or Kassina, which, at the time of the first accounts received by the Association, was the grand emporium of this eastern part of Central Africa. Since the recent Felatah conquest, it has much declined, and Kano has regained its ancient ascendancy. The walls of Kassina, like those of Kano, are of immense circuit, but not above a tenth of the enclosure is built upon; and though a great part is now in ruins, it still carries on a considerable trade with the Tuarick, with the merchants of Ghadamis, and with Tombuctoo.

The journey to and from Sackatoo was attended with very considerable danger, as this powerful state had at its very door two provinces, Goober and Zamfra, in a state of open rebellion, and who took advantage of this circumstance to waylay and plunder all travellers. Although, therefore, a large escort

of cavalry was sent both for and with him, even these thought themselves safe only by posting night and day, with exhausting rapidity, every one exclaiming,—‘Wo to the wretch that falls behind; he is sure to meet an unhappy end at the hands of the Gooberites.’ Sackatoo was found a well-built city, laid out in regular streets, and the population more dense than in any other part of Houssa; but no guess is made, what may be its amount, or even whether it, on the whole, exceeds that of the cities already visited. The trade is not very great, which is ascribed to the disturbed state of the surrounding country. The fine cloths are chiefly manufactured by slaves from Nyffee, who are said to excel all the other nations of Soudan in spinning and weaving.

Captain Clapperton was well received both by Sultan Bello and his minister the Gadado, though considerable and natural resentment was expressed at Major Denham having accompanied the expedition against their people. The apology however, that the Major had been actuated merely by curiosity, was well received, and his books, which had been transmitted to the Sultan, were handsomely returned. The palace consisted merely of a vast enclosure, containing a multitude of *coosies* or straw huts at some distance from each other. The Sultan was seated in one, which, being larger than the rest, resembled an English cottage, and was supported on pillars painted blue and white. He appears to have been an intelligent amiable man, with some liberal views. He was delighted with the telescope, the compass, and particularly with the quadrant, which he termed ‘the looking-glass of the sun.’ He wished some of the English books to be read to him, in order that he might hear the sound of the language, of which he expressed admiration. At last he said, ‘Every thing is wonderful, but you are the greatest curiosity of all.’ Captain Clapperton endeavoured to improve this disposition, in order to procure permission to proceed to Youri and Nyffee, where he would have found himself in the tract of Park, and might have completed the discoveries of that great traveller. The Sultan at first assured him of protection in the furtherance of this journey; he soon, however, began to draw a gloomy picture of the dangers attending it, from the disturbed state of the intermediate districts; and he expressed always deeper and deeper alarm, till it became evident that he had formed a fixed resolution against allowing the mission to proceed. This change is ascribed to the good offices of the Arab merchants, alarmed lest a rival commerce should be established by a new channel. Captain Clapperton was therefore

obliged, finally, to conclude, by requesting an escort to carry him back to Bornou.

It seems difficult to fix the limits of this empire of the Felatahs; and, indeed, doubtful whether any very precise limits exist. The delineation given by Sultan Bello himself, must be thrown aside at once as a piece of the most ridiculous boasting. Not only does it include Bornou and Mandara, which have now completely shaken off the yoke, but it comprehends Baghermi, and even Darfoor, in which it is probable that not one of his troops ever set foot. We hesitate not to pronounce a similar sentence on the western limits, represented as extending to the Gulf of Benin. Indeed we suspect the Sultan must have been not a little embarrassed by the repeated entreaties which Captain Clapperton made, in the simplicity of his heart, that his Majesty would fix upon some point of his maritime coast, at which the British might trade,—when it is quite evident, that he had not a foot of territory within several hundred miles of the sea. These applications he evaded under various pretexts; and, on being categorically questioned as to any particular place, vaguely replied, ‘God has given me all the land of the ‘Infidels.’’ Indeed we strongly suspect, that the extension of his empire to the west was very limited, and that the dread of exposing this, was one chief motive which made him rue the permission he seemed at first inclined to grant to the mission to proceed in that direction. This boasted empire, too, was braved in its very centre by rebel, or, more properly, independent states, whose roving bands rendered perilous the very approaches of the capital. During the time of our travellers’ residence, a caravan of a thousand people arrived in a state of entire route, having lost a great part of their people, and nearly all their property and baggage. Kano, again, the second capital, has, within a day’s march, the town and territory of Doura, which has, for five years, defied all the power of the empire.

Although, however, we must cut down very materially these lofty pretensions of Sultan Bello, it is not meant to insinuate that he does not rule over a considerable and valuable kingdom. It comprehends the greater part of Soudan, or Houssa, in which the Felatahs are the ruling people—the finest country, and the finest people, in all Africa. Houssa proves to be the name, not of a town or a kingdom, but of a region presenting a certain uniform aspect of nature and social existence. Although the Felatahs form the ruling part of the population, we no where find it defined with any exactness, wherein

their peculiarities consist. Denham (p. 115,) describes them as a very handsome people, not negro, nor ever intermarrying with the negroes, but of a deep copper-colour. It is, however, so deep, that Clapperton (p. 13.) roundly calls a Felatah a black man. Even by him, however, they were judged, in their mode of dress and general appearance, to resemble the inhabitants of Tetuan; and he met one of them who had spent some time with the Wahabis in Arabia, and reported that their language and that of the Felatahs was the same. Putting together these particulars, we should presume that this people were originally Arab, and probably sprung from that great Saracen migration which, in the tenth or eleventh century, founded the kingdoms of Ghana, Tocrur, and Berissa. Their original copper-colour would naturally be rendered much darker by a residence of so many centuries. Meantime we cannot fail to recognise in them, and generally in the inhabitants of this region, a superior people to that of Bornou—more energy of character—greater courage—more polished manners—an administration better conducted—and all the arts of life in a more improved state. The plough indeed does not seem to have passed the southern limit of Tripoli; but irrigation, the mainspring of tropical fertility, is practised with diligence. Instead of the poor grain of the gussub, wheat is raised plentifully, and is made into bread; and the markets are well supplied both with fruits and vegetables. The Moslem faith is professed, yet apparently with less bigotry. It appears, indeed, to be a prevalent opinion among some of the Arabs, that the Felatahs are not true Moslems, and will never see paradise; which last conclusion receives much countenance from the dreadful ravages of which they have been guilty. The boys at Sackatoo ran after our traveller, calling out, ‘There is the infidel!’—though there was one body who made an open profession of tolerant principles. These were the mendicant orders, who, in hope of two or three cowries, came daily under the windows calling out, *Allah atik jinné*; ‘God give thee paradise;’ and, says Captain Clapperton, ‘while almost all Africa doomed me to eternal perdition, I considered it obtaining their suffrages at a cheap rate.’

Of the intellectual condition of the Felatahs, the information is excessively scanty; but enough transpires to prove that it stands low. Captain Clapperton, on his way to Sackatoo, was told of a large collection of books that was in the possession of Sultan Bello; but he never appears to have instituted any inquiry, and certainly has made no communication to us on the subject. That a small one was in the possession of the Gadada, happens to be mentioned, in consequence of his being

found reading one of them 'on the Interpretation of Dreams,'—too fair a specimen, we fear, of the whole library. On the whole, we suspect there is pretty clear negative evidence, that not one of the nations of Central Africa has any existence as a literary or intellectual people. That there is some oral poetry can scarcely be considered an exception; for there is scarcely a tribe so rude, to whom the Muse does not inspire this language of the impassioned heart; and even

'She deigns to hear the *savage* youth repeat,  
In loose numbers wildly sweet,  
Their feather-cinctured chiefs and dusky loves.'

The talent of poetry, however, resides chiefly among the Arab caravan drivers; and, we suspect, is due, not so much to any tincture of acquired literature, as to that excited state of passion and feeling which arises in a life of wild and wandering adventure. Their love-strains are too much in the inflated and artificial style of Oriental hyperbole; but there is a dirge on Boo-Khaloom, which has such a portion of antique dignity and pathos, that we cannot forbear presenting it as a favourable specimen.

'Oh! trust not to the gun and the sword! The spear of the unbeliever prevails!

'Boo-Khaloom, the good and the brave, has fallen! Who shall now be safe? Even as the moon amongst the little stars, so was Boo-Khaloom amongst men! Where shall Fezzan now look for her protector? Men hang their heads in sorrow, while women wring their hands, rending the air with their cries! As a shepherd is to his flock, so was Boo-Khaloom to Fezzan!

'Give him songs! Give him music! What words can equal his praise? His heart was as large as the desert! His coffers were like the rich overflowings from the udder of the she-camel, comforting and nourishing those around him!

'Even as the flowers without rain perish in the field, so will the Fezzaneers droop; for Boo-Khaloom returns no more!

'His body lies in the land of the heathen! The poisoned arrow of the unbeliever prevails!

'Oh! trust not to the gun, and the sword! the spear of the heathen conquers. Boo-Khaloom, the good and the brave, has fallen! Who shall now be safe?'

Let us now take a hasty view of some of the leading characteristics of Interior Africa, though they wear too much of a gloomy and painful aspect.

Among these, robbery stands prominent. It exists, not as the deed of desperate and outlawed individuals, but as the great national and state concern of almost every community, great and small. In other parts of the world robbery is chiefly the offence

of the poor against the rich ; but here it is equally, or more of the rich against the poor ; for, in Africa, he who is destitute of every thing else, has at least himself, the richest booty that can tempt the plunderer. The greatest kings think it quite suitable to their dignity to send their subjects in large *ghrazzie*, to sweep together for sale a multitude of their unfortunate fellow-mortals. Prior to the marriage between the Sheikh of Bornou and the daughter of the Sultan of Mandara, a combined expedition was sent against the Musgow nation, which, after a desperate struggle, brought in three thousand slaves ; and the nuptials were celebrated with barbaric pomp, furnished out of the tears and blood of so many victims. Even when permanent conquest is the object, a large part of the population of the vanquished districts is collected, and sent off to the markets of Northern Africa.

Next in prominence to the preceding, and in intimate combination with it, is trade. The trade of Central Africa is not carried on by our quiet and regular machinery of ships, warehouses, counting-rooms, and shops. The articles which form its object, are escorted across the continent by large armed bodies, forming little armies ; and on their arrival, they are displayed in public and crowded markets, scenes of universal resort, not only for business, but for gaiety and exhibition. There is scarcely less glory, and as much of pride, pomp and circumstance, in trade as in war. The great merchants who, as we have seen, are also warriors, rank in the eye of the public with nobles, and even with princes.

These two moving springs of African activity unite in what is called the ' Slave trade.' Though this is divested of some of the horrors which attend its maritime consummation, yet, independent of the original outrage and violence with which the victims are dragged from their homes, many dreadful scenes attend their passage across the desert. The traders, indeed, whose interest it is that they should reach Barbary in tolerable condition, keep up their spirits, by telling them, that on arriving at Tripoli, they will be set free, and dressed in red, which is considered by them as the *ultimatum* of finery. In passing through the towns, they are decked out, and paraded in state, which seems to afford them some satisfaction. In the passage of the desert, however, carelessness or avarice often make very insufficient provision against those privations, which the strictest attention can scarcely avert. These, of course, fall first and heaviest on the slaves ; and to what extent, was but too evident, from their skeletons seen strewed in such numbers over the intervening desert. Captain Clapperton heard a truly af-

fecting example from a woman, who being unable any longer to carry her child, saw it snatched from her, and thrown on the ground to perish, while she herself was compelled, by the lash, to drag on her exhausted frame. The slaves retained in Soudan are tolerably treated, and it is said, appear gayer than their masters,—an observation not unfrequent: But this reckless gayety of those to whom reflection would be useless or miserable, only proves the mind to be in a degraded state, and is not probably inconsistent with a sense of secret wretchedness.

From these dark features, we must not however conclude, that an unbroken gloom hangs over the moral existence of Africa. National crimes, as they do not degrade a man in the eyes of others, or even his own, do not break the general character like those committed by individuals against law and public opinion. There seems even something peculiarly amiable and engaging in the social existence of the African. Warmth of friendship, hospitality, humanity, are virtues of which Park gives many shining instances, to which others are added by the present travellers. They are furnished even by Moslems, notwithstanding the hostile feelings cherished by a bigotted creed. When Major Denham was flying from the Felatah battle in a naked and miserable state, a young African Prince pulled off his own trowsers and gave them to him. A spirit of kindness and good humour indeed seems very generally to prevail in their domestic intercourse.

In the sketch now given of these new discoveries, we have purposely reserved that which chiefly excites the interest of Europe, their bearing upon those great problems in African Geography, which have so long occupied the speculations of the learned. Upon these very great light, we think, has been thrown by the present expedition.

The first place here is evidently claimed by the long disputed question respecting the course and termination of the Niger. Upon this subject, the positive intelligence is small and vague; but there is much negative information, as to what is *not* the Niger; and indeed this celebrated problem seems almost to have issued in ceasing to be one. It has lost, at least, that mysterious and romantic grandeur, with which, in the eyes of Europe, it had so long been invested. The Niger certainly cannot be the immense stream long supposed to drain the entire breadth of the African continent. The plain truth is, we doubt if there can very strictly be said to be such a river as the Niger. This celebrated name, which, with its cognate term of the *Neel Abeede*, signifies, *the Nile or river of the Black nations*, is evidently imposed by a foreign people, who are the North Afri-

cans, and who have communicated it to Europe: And an attentive observation will now make it evident, that they have applied it less to any individual river, than to an ideal compound of all those which flow along the central plain of interior Africa. To understand this error, we must take a glance at the physical structure of this part of the continent. From the frontier of Abyssina, to the heads of the Senegal and Gambia, it is now ascertained to be crossed by a chain of mountains nearly, if not altogether, continuous. From this chain, several great rivers descend into the plain of Soudan; where finding, it appears, a level lower than that of the desert, they turn from their northerly course, and begin to flow either east or west. It is also material to observe, that the great commercial lines of Africa are not *along* these rivers, but *across* them, at right angles. A caravan coming from northern Africa therefore had only to pass one stream, or perhaps follow its course for a short interval. They had no means of tracing the continuous course of any one; but to whatever part of this great plain they came, a river was found running in the same line, between the east and the west; and the idea might naturally arise, that this river was always one and the same. The direction of the stream is a point which easily escapes superficial observers; and nothing is more common than descriptions, in which the line of course is alone considered, and the river is described as running in the reverse of its real direction.

As the impression became thus general, that all the rivers of Central Africa were one, so the belief has been almost equally prevalent, that this one river was the Nile. Independent of the natural tendency to aggrandize a well known and favourite object, this idea was suggested by a peculiar intellectual process, not perhaps very obvious at first sight. Without entering into any abstruse questions as to the nature of general terms, we may at least observe, that they cannot be formed till several objects of the same class have been observed and compared. He who has seen only one of any class, possesses as yet no idea but of that individual object. Such was the case of the northern Africans in regard to the Nile. In Egypt there is no other river whatever; and in Barbary, none which can be placed at all on the same level in regard to magnitude. When, therefore, they came upon a similarly great stream, flowing across the central plain of Africa, it suggested to them, not the generic idea of river, but the individual idea of Nile. The prepossession thus formed, was strengthened by local feelings; and the unknown region between Nubia and Soudan, afforded a space, through which a river could be drawn in any direction that suited pre-



conceived ideas. Edrisi, and the other Arabian geographers, chiefly acquainted with a region in which the main stream flowed *westerly*, effected their object, by supposing it to arise from *the same source* with the Egyptain Nile, and thence to flow westward, across the entire breadth of Africa, to the Atlantic. In modern times, since Tombuctoo and Jenné became the grand *emporia*, the caravan merchants are more familiar with the Niger of Park, flowing eastward. Hence, they imagine it to continue in that direction across Africa, till, by *joining* the Bahr-el Abiad, it establishes in an opposite way that identity with the Egyptian Nile, which is so deeply rooted in the African mind.

The writer of the article *Africa*, in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, had already shown, that the opposite accounts transmitted to us, could only be reconciled by supposing two rivers, both called Niger, and one of them not only different, but flowing in an opposite direction from the Niger of Park. This river has been found by the present mission; which has moreover proved the river system of Africa to be much more complex than former materials could have led us to suppose. We may now distinctly trace *four* rivers, which have usually been considered as combining to form the mighty ideal stream of interior Africa. These are, 1. The *Senegal*. Though, since the expedition of Park, its pretensions are entirely withdrawn, no doubt was entertained for many centuries of its being the *embouchure* by which the Niger entered the ocean. It was considered as such by the Arabians, who indeed knew very little about it; by Leo, who might have known more; and, till the eighteenth century, by all the nations of Europe, who knew the Senegal, but not the interior waters from which it was supposed to issue. 2. The river discovered by Park, and by the natives variously called *Joli* (Ba), Colle, Quolla, Quorra, Quarra, Kowara,—an enumeration which will show, that however widely the extremes diverge, the name is radically one and the same. This river is now ascertained as flowing almost due south from Tombuctoo, and passing about four days' journey to the west of Sackatoo; but all the notices here contained respecting its farther course and termination, are exceedingly vague. 3. A river called the Quarrama, for the knowledge of which we are indebted to the present mission. It flows *westward*, passes by or near Kano, Kashna, Sackatoo, and all the great cities of Soudan, and falls finally into the Quolla. This is evidently the river which suggested to the early Arabians, all whose settlements were in this part of Africa, the idea of a Nile of the Negroes, flowing westward across Africa. It is the Niger, reported by the Shreef to Mr Lucas as passing by Kassina, and

there flowing westward; a statement since entirely discredited, from being supposed inconsistent with Park's observations. 4. The Yeou, which we have seen flowing *eastward* into the Tchad. This apparently must have been the western Nile of Herodotus, to which the Nasamonian explorers were carried across the desert, and where they found a city inhabited by Negroes, and a river flowing from west to east. It was the easiest and most natural point to be reached from their country, which was Tripoli; whereas it would have required an immense circuit to arrive at the river of Tombuctoo. Probably also this river forms the Ethiopian part of that vast and devious course, partly above, and partly under ground, which Pliny assigns to his combined Niger and Nile. The early Arabians, who did not much frequent this river, evidently however viewed it as the early part of their Nile of the Negroes; while those of the present day, finding it flow in the same direction with the river of Tombuctoo, very naturally regard it as a continuation of that river, in its course to gain the Nile of Egypt.

Of these claimants for the name of Niger, the river explored by Park, though not the earliest, is the most considerable, and that which at present is fully established as such in the mind of Europeans. Whether it terminates in the Gulf of Benin, or in an inland sea, it must have a course of nearly two thousand miles, which will make it rank with the first of the Old, though not of the New, World. But still it will not possess either the unparalleled magnitude, or the *unique* and peculiar character, which have so long been ascribed to the Niger. Of the two preceding suppositions, that of the Gulf of Benin seems to have fixed itself in the mind of the public. Our own opinion, we confess, leans pretty strongly to an inland termination. A long argument would be out of place, on a subject which will probably be soon decided, and is carried on, no doubt, at our own extreme peril, when a contradiction may so speedily arrive. Yet, since this opinion has been stated, it may be permitted hastily to sketch the grounds of it. We still lay much stress on the great belt of mountains which here crosses Africa. The unbroken continuity which our maps assign to it has indeed been ridiculed; but the very same continuity exists in the Andes, the Himalaeh, the Altai, and all the great barrier chains of the globe. The present expedition discloses a vast portion of it hitherto unknown; the mountains of Mandara, of Jacoba, of Adamowa, all in the same line, and stretching westward till, if they do not join the mountains of Kong, they can leave only a narrow intervening gap, for which, in mountain groups of this magnitude, there is no sort of precedent. As if to dispel all

doubt, we find a range laid down at this very point, in the map attached to the present volume, upon information, we believe, obtained by Major Laing from a Sheikh of Gadamis. Again, in the name of none of the rivers of Benin, is there any version of that which we have seen to continue so long radically unaltered. The estuaries on that part of the coast make a very formidable appearance on the map; but in general they are sluggish, and almost stagnant waters, partaking of the nature of lakes, bays, and even marshes. Supposing them to drain the southern waters of the great chain, reported as higher than the northern, there will remain no mystery in their streams being very ample. In Benin, there are no Arab caravans, no Mahometan population—nothing which indicates a free intercourse with Soudan. Captain Adams, who traded long on this coast, saw these only at Ardrah, where all the slaves from Houssa assured him that they had come *on foot*, by a long and laborious journey, and never heard of any communication with the sea by water.

If the Niger does not reach the Atlantic, we do not think, with all deference to the imperial map of Sultan Bello, that it can be seriously supposed to perform the immense circuit necessary to make it become the Shary, and enter the Tchad under that name. The obstacles would be too mighty; it would have to cross the central chain *twice*, and to penetrate that abyss of mountains, which extend southward from the kingdom of Mandara. If the question, however, be put, where it does terminate, we must confess that we have certainly no materials for fixing on any precise spot; but that it should terminate in a great lake, similar to the Tchad, has nothing either improbable or anomalous. The present travellers understood that there were great lakes in the country to the south of Sackatoo; and there have been several reports of an immense one at or near Nyffee. This is even laid down by M. Dupuis, in his late map of Central Africa, the errors of which are no doubt extensive; but as this feature is not very distant from Ashantee, where he collected his information, it is not unlikely to be correct. We have no room to comment on the confused and contradictory statements contained in the present volume, representing the 'Kowara' to fall into the sea at Rakah and Fundah, places which do not exist on any part of the African coast; and we believe they would be found to agree better with the supposition of the receptacle meant being an inland sea, than the ocean.

An attempt has been made to preserve a remnant at least of the theory which identifies the Niger and the Nile, by representing the latter as flowing eastward out of the Tchad. Without speculating on this as a matter of physical possibility, we shall

only remark, that the positive testimony against it appears almost as strong as possible. Major Denham, indeed, was obliged to leave about a third part of that great lake unexplored; but his friend Barca Gana, who had four times made the complete circuit in his military expeditions, declared his perfect assurance, that the lake had no outlet. Tahr, an Arab chief, who had spent a sort of migratory life upon these shores, was equally decisive upon this point; and every other testimony was to the same effect. We presume it to be needless, notwithstanding the authority of Pliny, to discuss the speculation of its waters finding a passage *under ground* to the Nile. But it has been said, that because the waters of the lake are fresh, therefore it cannot be the final receptacle of the rivers which fall into it. If, however, we consider what is the cause of the usual saltiness of lakes that have no outlet, it will at once appear, that this cause can have no application in the present instance. It can only be, that the water poured in by the rivers, holds in solution some saline particles, which, remaining while the fluid evaporates, insensibly accumulate, and render the lake salt. But the feeders of the lake of Bornou flow through a country, in the whole of which there does not exist a single saline particle. They cannot therefore bring any salt into it; and if none enters, none can ever accumulate.

Having obtained, from the present discoveries, a tolerably precise delineation of this most interior part of the African continent, it may be curious, and not without historical interest, to compare with it the successive accounts hitherto received, and the delineations founded upon them by the most eminent geographers. Some of these will be found more accurate than has been generally supposed; and, in others, the being able to trace the sources of error, may serve as a lesson to future inquirers.

We are satisfied, on the whole, that the knowledge possessed by the ancients of this region was limited and vague. The Romans had formed no regular route over the desert; and though some daring adventurers pushed their way across its expanse, their accounts of its extent and dreary character were discredited even by Ptolemy. We cannot, however, assent to the sentence of M. Gosselin, that the knowledge of this geographer did not reach beyond the tract of Barbary, behind the Atlas; though, ignorant of the breadth of the desert, he has no doubt blended the features of that territory with those of Central Africa. In his details of the latter too, there is certainly a good deal of confusion; yet the present information seems to enable us to identify several of his grand features—the *Mons Mantrus*, for ex-

ample, and the branch of the Niger, flowing thence into the great lake of Nigritia. These objects and features seem to agree with the mountains of Mandara, the lake Tchad, and the river Shary, which in that case will be a *fifth* Niger. Ptolemy has doubtless placed them much too near the sea; but we suspect that his information, obtained only by the circuitous route between Nubia and Bornou, reached only across a part of the Continent, which he then hypothetically united with the coast of the Atlantic, the existence of which was known to him from other sources.

On the decline of the empire, and the rise of the Saracen power, this part of Africa was brought into more conspicuous notice. When the Caliphate was shaken by the contests between the rival dynasties of the Ommiades and the Fatemites, the vanquished party were impelled in quest of new seats beyond the desert. They introduced the camel and the caravan system, and soon paved as it were a regular route across this hitherto almost impassable ocean of sand. They colonized and conquered the finest part of Soudan, situated along the river, which Mr Clapperton calls Quarrama; but which, in their eye, was the Nile of the Negroes. These settlements excited considerable interest; and the information transmitted respecting them was collected, in that comparative era of Mahomedan light and knowledge, by several geographers of some eminence, among whom Edrisi, in particular, has left somewhat full delineations of them. These, however, were little known in Europe, till D'Anville, in default of more modern materials, introduced their leading positions into the map of Africa, where they have since remained, though subject to much discussion as to their soundness and value. The result of the present expedition appears to us, with exception of the above errors in their river system, to be decidedly in their favour; and we were not a little surprised to find all their leading positions still existing under the relative situation, and even, with such variations as might be expected, under the names which, at that distant period, these writers have assigned to them.

The leading features described as then existing in Central Africa, are the cities of *Tocrur* and *Ghana*, both capitals of the kingdoms of the same name, with the cities of *Berissa* subject to the former, and of *Tirka* to the latter. *Tocrur* (called by Bakri, *Takrour*) had hitherto eluded all modern inquiry. Major Rennell, having in vain attempted to learn any thing respecting this 'metropolis of the central empire of Africa,' concludes, that it exists no longer, or had acquired a different name. We recognise it at once, however, when we find Sultan Bello describing his kingdom as the empire of *Takror*. Indeed, as in Oriental

names, the *s* and *t* are very convertible, it seems likely that Sackatoo's is a mere corruption of the same name. This opinion is not in the least shaken by the statement here made, that it has existed only for thirteen years, when we find similar dates assigned to Kassina and Kuku, cities described six hundred years ago by the Arabian writers. The Kings seem to have palmed this recent origin upon our travellers, in the ambition of passing for the founders of these capitals, which perhaps they might enlarge, and raise even from temporary neglect.

Ghana is manifestly the same city as the modern Kano. This superb capital, described then as the pride of interior Africa, has suffered deeply by becoming subject, first, to Kassina, and now to Sackatoo. It still retains, however, its vast circuit, though only partially filled up, its manufactures, superior to any others in Houssa, and its trade, which still attracts crowded caravans from the remotest quarters of the Continent. We discover even the lake or marsh dividing the city into two parts, described by Edrisi, but to which our maps allow an unauthorized magnitude. In Edrisi's time the glass windows of the palace were considered an *unique* feature in this part of the world. Mr Clapperton observed in the governor's residence a window frame-work in the European style, though it no longer contained any glass.

Mr Clapperton enables us to identify with equal ease the two minor positions of Berissa and Tirka. The former, described as a small, but flourishing and trading city, is clearly recognised in Bershee, which, corresponding to Edrisi's description, is exactly midway between the two great capitals. It is on the opposite side of the river to Kassina, and in the same commercial line, so that it was probably eclipsed by the rise of the latter city; but it appears still to be considerable, and situated in a very fine and beautiful country. Finally, Tirka, at six day's journey to the south-east of Ghana, is fixed both by name and position at Girkwa, which Clapperton and Edrisi alike describe as a large and flourishing city, though not on the same scale as Ghana or Tocrur. The market, however, is said to be superior to that of Tripoli.

But where is *Wangara*, the country of pure gold, the foundation of such an immense trade, and the brightest jewel in the crown of Ghana? This country is mentioned by Hornemann and Bowdich, under the titles of Ungura and Oongoros. Mr Clapperton in fact met at Bershee with the governor of Oongoro returning to his province; but never having heard, we suppose, either of Oongoro or Wangara, he made no use of this valuable opportunity of gaining information respecting this

remarkable country. This, however, was precisely the route to Edrisi's Wangara; and some rumours scattered through the volume point out the region to the south of Houssa as traversed by a great river, containing extensive lakes, and producing much gold. Though, therefore, we have as yet no details of Wangara, it appears still to exist, under the same name, and the same features ascribed to it by Edrisi.

In the eastern part of Central Africa, Edrisi's two leading positions are Kuku and Cauga. D'Anville has thrust Kuku up into the heart of the desert, and made it almost to border on the Nile. Mr Murray (*Discoveries in Africa*, B. III. ch. 1.) has shown, that this position is wholly inconsistent with the data of Edrisi, and that Kuku could not be any other than the kingdom of Bornou. It is found accordingly to be the capital of that country, or at least the residence of its ruling sovereign. Probably it may have passed through periods of neglect and decay, as it no longer presents that great magnitude, which, according to Edrisi, made it conspicuous among the Negro countries. Cauga, we apprehend, must be Loggun, though the name has certainly undergone rather a formidable transmutation; but the distance of twenty days south from Kuku, the equal distance with that city from Ghana, the industrious and prosperous character of its inhabitants, the skill of the females in magic, which probably coincides with that superior intelligence ascribed to them by Major Denham—these features, notwithstanding some minor difficulties, appear to make it impossible to fix it anywhere else.

To the west of Tocrur, Edrisi has only one position, Sala, two days' journey distant; but as Mr C. affords no details in that direction, it cannot be identified. Here terminate all these early settlements of the Arabians, and all precise knowledge on the part of their geographers. They now describe the Nile of the Negroes flowing westward, till, after sixteen days' journey, not a third of the real distance, it falls into the Atlantic; while at its mouth is the island of Ulil, whence salt is supplied to all the negro territories. We have here a vague combination of various features—the ocean known or presumed to exist, upon other grounds—the lake Dibbie, probably in some degree confounded with it—the great salt mines in the western part of the desert—and Walet, or Oualet, the principal market for salt.

As we have thus proved the accuracy of the Arab writers, in regard to a large extent of interior Africa, including most of that visited by the present mission, we may safely compare their description of its state in the twelfth century with what it

now is. The general impression produced, is that of a remarkable absence of any change, either for the better or worse. The picture of Edrisi equally presents the rich attire and crowded retinue of the *grandeos*, contrasted with the rude dress and scanty fare of the body of the people—the great caravans traversing the deserts in every direction—the pompous display of their wares in the commercial cities. Already we see, with regret, the full establishment of the horrid system of slave hunting, and regular expeditions from all the great states, against their unfortunate brethren in the south, for the purpose of carrying them off as captives, to be transported into the most distant regions of the globe. There appears only one very remarkable change, in the extinction of that immense gold trade which once centered in Ghana, and is described as then the main attraction, which drew thither merchants from the remotest extremities of Africa. In Bornou, Major Denham did not see a particle of gold, though he understood that the *Tuarick* sometimes carry it northwards from Soudan; but this is not confirmed by his companion, who even observes, in relation to Kano, that though trinkets of silver were exhibited in the market, there were none of gold. Gold, in short, seems to have disappeared as entirely from the trade of Central Africa, as from the currency of Scotland. Yet it is still described as abounding in those southern districts from which it was formerly drawn. Mr Clapperton, not aware apparently that such a trade ever existed, made no inquiries as to its cessation. We can only guess, on finding that the ancient demand was chiefly from the merchants of Sigilnessa, (the Morocco frontier), and those of the ‘remotest west,’ that after the rise of Tombuctoo, that city, so much more commodiously situated for these quarters, may have become the exclusive market for gold; while the Tripolitan caravans, as Major Denham informs us, have only one call, which is always for slaves.

We need not dwell long on the subsequent accounts. In the fourteenth century, Leo Africanus published his description, which marks some new places and new names. Of the former, the chief was Tombuctoo, founded in the thirteenth century by an expedition from Morocco, to which he represents all the other states as subject, and which in fact has ever since been the most celebrated of the central *emporium*. He mentions, for the first time, the names of Kassina, Bornou, and Ghana under its modern appellation of Kano. Leo has strangely puzzled geographers, by stating that Kano was five hundred miles from the Niger; yet if we consider that *his* Niger, like ours, was the river of Tombuctoo, the statement will prove very nearly correct.



The moderns were involved in great darkness as to the interior of Africa. Finding, in the same line with the reported Niger, the great estuaries of the Senegal and Gambia, they never doubted that these were the *embouchures* by which it entered the ocean, and busied themselves in vain efforts to ascend by them to Tombuctoo and Ghana. Yet there occur, in maps of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, some features with which it is impossible not to be struck. There is an immense lake, with islands, under the name of Guardia, which does not sound very unlike an European corruption of Tchad; also a lake of Bornou, sometimes identified with, sometimes separated from, the Guardia. We have sought in vain for the authority upon which these features are laid down; but suspect that, though not mentioned by Di Barros, they must have originated with the Portuguese, who made at one time great efforts at interior discovery.

In the seventeenth century, Delisle and D'Anville effected a considerable reform, founded upon information derived from the French settlements on the Senegal. They ascertained, as a separate river from it, the greater interior one called the Niger, the latter flowing in a contrary direction. With regard to the positions on its supposed course to Wangara, D'Anville brought out with advantage those of Edrisi and his contemporaries. Unable, however, to procure any authority for the lakes of Guardia and Bornou, he, after some hesitation, obliterated them from the map, on which they have never again re-appeared.

A material improvement in the maps of Africa was produced by the discoveries of the African Association, and particularly of Park. All the western interior of that continent was then fixed by precise observation; but the eastern, of which we are now treating, depended still on the confused and often misunderstood reports of native travellers. In combining these, all the care and skill of Major Rennell could not escape important errors. These occurred particularly in regard to Bornou, the most unfortunate of countries in regard to geographic delineation. We have seen how it was deprived of its lake; and, from being placed on the line of the central rivers, it was now moved to quite an erroneous position. Yet the route given by the Shreef to Mr Lucas, of fifty days' journey, or six hundred and fifty miles, if it had been extended due south, as the general tenor of the accounts would have dictated, would have come very near to the real position. But this statement was accompanied with another, that Bornou was only twenty-five days' journey west from the Nile. This probably must have

meant the upper part of the Bahr-el-Abiad; but Major Rennell, applying the statement to the course through Nubia, could only conciliate the two routes by making the direction south-east, which carried Bornou into the heart of the desert, seven degrees north, and eight degrees east of where it really stood. Major Rennell had also, from the same quarter, an excellent route to Kassina, with a positive assurance that the direction was south-west, which, had it been followed, would have placed that city and Ghana nearly in their true positions; but though this direction was afterwards repeated by Mr Magra, the Major did not venture so far to innovate on D'Anville, who had made it due south. He merely gave it two slight bends westward, quite insufficient to rectify the errors. Ghana thus remained four degrees, and Kassina two and a half degrees, too far east. It is somewhat curious, that Sackatoo is nearly in the precise longitude of Major Rennell's Tocur. One circumstance indeed appears from the present volume, which must have considerably misled these eminent geographers. The day's journeys of Edrisi, being the rude measurement which he always employs, when calculated along the plain of Soudan, are only about half the length of those extended across the desert. The reason appears to be, that, in the latter case, the caravans pushed across by the most direct line, and with the utmost possible speed; while, in the former, they chose a circuitous route, for the purpose of including the great cities, and often halted a day or two at each.

We had intended to close this article with some observations respecting the future prospects of this part of Africa, whether relating to the commercial intercourse of Britain, or to their own internal improvement and civilization. But we have already passed the limits which we suspect our readers will be disposed to consider reasonable; and may be able to treat the subject with greater advantage, after the issue of the new expeditions under Laing and Clapperton shall present to us a complete and connected view of the entire breadth of this part of the continent.

---

ART. VII. *The Life and Remains of the Rev. EDWARD DANIEL CLARKE, LL. D., Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Cambridge.* pp. 667. 4to. London, Cowie & Co. 1824.

IN collecting and editing these Memoirs of Dr Clarke, his friend Mr Otter has rendered a most acceptable service to the literary world, while he conferred a real favour upon all

who knew, and therefore esteemed, that aimable and accomplished individual. The great work, indeed, in which Dr Clarke's travels are recorded, preserves a minute account of by far the most interesting portion of his life; but the curiosity is natural and laudable, to learn the rest of a man's history, to whose adventurous spirit and persevering industry, combined, in a rare degree, with quick and lively parts, we are indebted for perhaps the most instructive and engaging book of travels ever published in this country; and many particulars of his personal narrative, even during those travels, omitted in the work, as being perhaps deemed below the dignity of the occasion, are to be gleaned from his correspondence, and must prove attractive to every intelligent reader.

The family of Dr Clarke have for several generations been advantageously known in the republic of letters. The celebrated Dr Wotton was his great-grandfather. His paternal grandfather was William Clarke, author of the valuable work on Saxon Coins, and commonly called 'Mild William Clarke,' on account of the extraordinary sweetness of temper which he united with great literary attainments, and (what was perhaps reckoned still more unlikely to be found in such company) considerable church preferment, he having had a prebend and a good living. That this excellent man was far from being so meek as to dislike an epigram, we learn from the admirable one which he wrote on the inscription (*Hæc est domus ultima*) upon the vault of the Richmond family, in Chichester Cathedral.

'Did he, who thus inscrib'd the wall,  
Not read, or not believe, St Paul?  
Who says there is, where'er it stands,  
Another house not made with hands;  
Or may we gather from these words,  
That house is not a house of Lords?' p. 10.

His son, Mr Clarke, succeeded him in the rectory of Buxted, and having, in earlier life, passed some time abroad, as chaplain to Lord Bristol's embassy at Madrid, he published Letters on the Spanish Nation, which are favourably spoken of. He was esteemed an excellent scholar, having been a pupil of Markland, and had prepared an adaptation of Faber's Thesaurus, by transposing it from the radical arrangement, and a folio edition of the Greek Testament, with prolegomena and notes—the latter of which, Mr Otter informs us, are in the hands of his surviving son, Dr Stanier Clarke, a gentleman well known to the public by his successful cultivation of Letters, and distinguished for the talents and virtues which seem to have adorned all the members of this excellent family.

Edward Daniel, the second son, was born in 1769; and showed, while yet a child, the same adventurous spirit and vehement, but not always discriminating, curiosity, which distinguished him in after life. Every one who has studied the works of the man, will recognise distinct lineaments of his character, in the following anecdotes of the boy.

‘ Having upon some occasion accompanied his mother on a visit to a relation’s house in Surrey, he contrived, before the hour of their return, so completely to stuff every part of the carriage with stones, weeds, and other natural productions of that county, then entirely new to him, that his mother, upon entering, found herself embarrassed how to move; and, though the most indulgent creature alive to her children, she was constrained, in spite of the remonstrances of the boy, to eject them one by one from the window. For one package, however, carefully wrapped up in many a fold of brown paper, he pleaded so hard, that he at last succeeded in retaining it: and when she opened it at night after he had gone to sleep, it was found to contain several greasy pieces of half-burnt reeds, such as were used at that time in the farmers’ kitchens in Surrey, instead of candles; which, he said, upon inquiry, were specimens of an invention that could not fail of being of service to some poor old women of the parish, to whom he could easily communicate how they were prepared.

‘ Another childish circumstance, which occurred about the same time, is worthy of recital, not only because it indicates strongly the early prevalence of the spirit to which we have alluded, but because it accounts in some measure for the extraordinary interest he took throughout his life in the manners and the fortunes of gypsies. At this period, his eldest brother was residing with his relations at Chichester; and, as his father’s infirm state of health prevented him from seeing many persons at his house, Edward was permitted frequently to wander alone in the neighbourhood, guarded only by a favourite dog, called Keeper. One day, when he had stayed out longer than usual, an alarm was given that he was missing: search was made in every direction, and hour after hour elapsed without any tidings of the child. At last, his old nurse, who was better acquainted with his haunts, succeeded in discovering him in a remote and rocky valley above a mile from his father’s house, surrounded by a group of gypsies, and deeply intent upon a story which one of them was relating to him. The boy, it seems, had taken care to secure their good will with some victuals which he had brought from his mother’s pantry; and they, in return, had been exerting their talents for his amusement. Many of the stories which he thus obtained were treasured with great delight in his memory, and often brought out, as occasion served, for the amusement of his rustic audience.’  
p. 26—28.

He received the rudiments of education first at Uckfield, and

afterwards at Tonbridge, under the celebrated Vicesimus Knox, —a man to be praised as often as he is named, for his literary accomplishments, and yet more to be respected, for the rare independence of mind which he ever displayed, and his steady adherence, through the worst times, to the cause of liberty. At the age of sixteen, his father's health declining, and the paternal family being very much dependent upon his life, Edward was sent to Jesus College, in order to take advantage of a small office obtained through the kindness of Bishop Beadon, then head of that House; and this, with an exhibition from Tonbridge school, and a scholarship on Sir T. Rustat's foundation, not yielding altogether an income of ninety pounds a year, constituted the whole of his resources while he remained at the University. His father died before he had been there two years; and his mother having, some time previously to that irreparable loss, informed him of the limited means which would remain to the family, he gave a promise, in the sequel most religiously kept by him, never to exceed the sum which his College appointments might afford. Whatever arrears his expenses occasioned (and the liberality of Mr Plainpin, the tutor, enabled him to leave some bills unpaid), he discharged out of the first profits which afterwards accrued from his pupils.

The three years which he thus passed before taking his Bachelor's degree, appear to have been employed with very slender profit. The peculiar studies of the place had no charms for him, to whom mathematical science was always repulsive; and how far classical pursuits then formed any considerable part of the academic course, may be conjectured from Mr Otter's statement, that 'all the classical lectures which it is remembered were given during the three years of his residence, were confined to the two little tracts of Tacitus, *De Moribus Germanorum*, and *De Vitâ Agricolaë*.' Upon this curious anecdote we cannot avoid pausing to observe, that although a very great and salutary change has of late years been effected in the discipline of Cambridge, where classical literature (as our author observes in a note, p. 43) has been cultivated with great diligence and success, yet assuredly the luckless wight who, in the time of Dr Clarke's *status pupillaris*, should have ventured to raise his voice against the very scanty *modicum* of ancient literature furnished to the ingenious youth who flocked round the banks of the Cam, would have drawn down upon himself the heaviest displeasure of 'all true friends to the established order of things' —more especially if the remark should have been accompanied with any indelicate allusions to the state of matters near the

Forth and the Clyde. This affords a most instructive lesson to reformers, and a warning to the enemies of all improvement. We now see it freely admitted, by a fast friend of the system—one who has held College and University offices, and probably at this moment enjoys College preferment—that not many years ago there was literally nothing done to teach the classics by those who were paid for the purpose. We say nothing; well convinced, that there is not a man in Cambridge who would not now be ashamed of calling the exposition of a few pages of Tacitus in three years, any thing. It will also be readily admitted now, that there never was any place, pretending to call itself a seat of learning, at any time since the revival of letters, where less was taught than this. But why are such admissions so easily made now? Only because the glaring defect has been remedied. Any one who observed it in Dr Clarke's time, and suggested the remedy, must have been, of course, a 'visionary'—a 'malecontent'—a 'schemer'—a lover of 'newfangled systems'—an advocate of 'untried theories,'—and withal an enemy of the Church, and probably of the State too. So would any one be now called, who should point out the many defects, as glaring, which still exist in the system of University education; but a much smaller number of revilers would give him those choice names; and his suggestions, favourably received by a far larger class, both within the College walls and without, would far more speedily produce the result to which the wise and the good are perpetually looking—reform without destruction.

Although Dr Clarke profited but little by the learning of the place, he partook not of its vices, of which 'the prevailing one,' we are informed, 'was excess of drinking.' He was popular, however, among his fellow collegians, in an extraordinary degree; and in the only branch of display, English declamations, which his acquirements allowed him to attempt, he seems to have had considerable success. His manners, and the regularity of his habits, obtained the favour of his superiors in the College, and every advantage was bestowed upon him to which such merit could fairly lead; while, notwithstanding the constant elasticity of his spirits, he never incurred a single admonition for any excess or any neglect. The following anecdotes are characteristic.

'To illustrate the desultory nature of his occupations at this time, and to give an early specimen of the talent which he always possessed in a very high degree, of exciting an interest in the minds of others towards the objects which occupied his own, it may be worth while here to give some account of a balloon, with which he amused the University in the third year of his residence. This balloon, which was magnificent in its size, and splendid in its decorations, was

constructed and manœuvred, from first to last, entirely by himself. It was the contrivance of many anxious thoughts, and the labour of many weeks, to bring it to what he wished ; and when, at last, it was completed to his satisfaction, and had been suspended for some days in the College Hall, of which it occupied the whole height, he announced a time for its ascension. There was nothing at that period very new in balloons, or very curious in the species which he had adopted ; but by some means he had contrived to disseminate, not only within the walls of his own College, but throughout the whole University, a prodigious curiosity respecting the fate of his experiment. On the day appointed, a vast concourse of people was assembled, both within and around the College ; and the balloon having been brought to its station, the grass-plot within the cloisters, was happily launched by himself, amidst the applause of all ranks and degrees of gownsmen, who had crowded the roof, as well as the area of the cloisters, and filled the contiguous apartments of the master's lodge. The whole scene, in short, succeeded to his utmost wish ; nor is it easy to forget the delight which flashed from his eye, and the triumphant wave of his cap, when the machine, with its little freight, (a kitten,) having cleared the College battlements, was seen soaring in full security over the towers of the great gate. Its course was followed on horseback by several persons, who had voluntarily undertaken to recover it ; and all went home delighted with an exhibition, upon which nobody would have ventured, in such a place, but himself ; while none were found to lament the unseasonable waste of so much ingenuity and industry, or to express their surprise that to the pleasure of this passing triumph he should have sacrificed the whole of an important term, in which most of his contemporaries were employed in assiduous preparations for their approaching disputations in the schools.

‘ But to gratify and amuse others was ever a source of the greatest satisfaction to himself. In the pursuit of this object, he thought little of any sacrifice he was to make, and still less of any ulterior advantage he might gain ; and though it was important to his enjoyment, that the means employed should be, more or less, of a literary or scientific kind, it was by no means essential that they should gratify his own vanity, or reflect any credit upon himself. As a proof of this, it may be mentioned, that only a few months before this exhibition of the balloon in the University, which seemed calculated to excite an interest amongst thousands, he bestowed quite as much time and labour in the construction of an orrery, for the sole purpose of delivering a course of lectures on astronomy in his mother's house, to a single auditor ; and that one, his sister.’ p. 54, 55.

Upon his leaving Cambridge he was chosen by the Duke of Dorset to reside as tutor with his nephew, the Honourable H. Tufton, youngest brother of the Earl of Thanet, and spent about two years with him, during one of which they made an ex-

tensive tour in England and Wales. Dr Clarke having kept a journal of this excursion, threw it afterwards into the form of a book of travels, and published it, but without his name. It was a crude and hasty performance, in the judgment of Mr Otter, borne out by a few extracts which he gives of it; but indicated a capacity for greater things, and abounded in proofs of a lively imagination, and a kind disposition. The testimony which our author bears to the character at once manly and amiable of the pupil, and the reciprocal attachment and successful cares of the master, are equally creditable to both.

When this connexion was terminated, by Mr Tufston entering the army, Dr Clarke accepted the invitation of Lord Berwick to travel with him for two years; and they proceeded through part of Germany and Switzerland to Piedmont, and thence by Genoa to Florence, Rome and Naples. He now appears to have set himself to study more earnestly and more profitably than before; and to have supplied in part the deficiency of his earlier education. The love of travel and adventure, which through life was his ruling passion, now gained entire possession of him; and some of his letters written at this period, lose little by a comparison with the most interesting parts of his great work. At Naples, the eruption of Vesuvius was an object of irresistible attraction to him. He appears to have ascended thrice so as to reach the crater, and to have made twelve expeditions in all, up the mountain. On one occasion which he describes, serious perils seem to have been encountered. We can only afford room for a short extract, from one letter on this subject.

‘ The eruption from the crater increased with so much violence, that we proceeded to make our experiments and observations as speedily as possible. A little above the source of the lava, I found a chimney of about four feet in height, from which proceeded smoke and sometimes stones. I approached and gathered some pure sulphur, which had formed itself upon the edges of the mouth of this chimney, the smell of which was so powerful, that I was forced to hold my breath all the while I remained there. I seized an opportunity to gain a momentary view down this aperture, and perceived nothing but the glare of the red hot lava that passed beneath it. We then returned to examine the lava at its source. Sir W. Hamilton had conceived that no stones thrown upon a current of lava would make any impression. We were soon convinced of the contrary. Light bodies of five, ten, and fifteen pounds weight made little or no impression even at the source, but bodies of sixty, seventy, and eighty pounds were seen to form a kind of bed upon the surface of the lava, and float away with it. A stone of three hundred weight, that had been thrown out by the crater, and lay near the source of the cur-



rent of lava, I raised upon one end, and then let it fall in upon the liquid lava, when it gradually sunk beneath the surface, and disappeared. If I wished to describe the manner in which it acted upon the lava, it was like a loaf of bread thrown into a bowl of very thick honey, which gradually involves itself in the heavy liquid that surrounds it, and then slowly sinks to the bottom. The lava itself had a glutinous appearance, and, although it resisted the most violent impression, seemed as if it might easily be stirred with a common walking-stick. A small distance from its source, as it flows on, it acquires a darker tint upon its surface, is less easily acted upon, and, as the stream gets wider, the surface having lost its state of perfect solution, grows harder and harder, and cracks into innumerable fragments of very porous matter, to which they give the name of scorix, and the appearance of which has led many to suppose that it proceeded thus from the mountain itself, being composed of materials less soluble than the rest of the lava, lighter, and of course liable to float continually on the surface. There is, however, no truth in this. All lava has its first exit from its native volcano, flows out in a liquid state, and all equally in fusion. The appearance of the scorix is to be attributed only to the action of the external air, and not to any difference in the materials that compose it, since any lava whatever, separated from its channel, at its very source, and exposed to the action of the external air, immediately cracks, becomes porous, and alters its form. As we proceeded downward, this became more and more evident, and the same lava, which at its original source flowed in perfect solution, undivided, and free from loose encumbrances of any kind, a little farther down, had its surface loaded with scorix in such a manner, that upon its arrival at the bottom of the mountain, the whole current resembled nothing so much as a rolling heap of unconnected cinders from an iron foundry.

“The fury of the crater, continuing to increase, menaced us with destruction if we continued any longer in its neighbourhood. A large stone thrown out to a prodigious height, hung for some time over our heads in the air. Every one gave himself up for lost, until it fell harmless beyond us, shattering itself into a thousand fragments which rolled into the valley below. We had not left this spot above five minutes before a shower of stones, issuing from the crater, fell thick upon it, covering the source of the lava, and all the parts about it; so that, had we waited, as I begged to do a little longer, every one of us would have been crushed to atoms.” pp. 105–107.

The following sketches are of a different cast, but possess very considerable merit.

“I am much refreshed by sitting in the cool air of the balcony to my breakfast room; and amused with the enchanting prospect I have now before my eyes. All the bay of Naples, covered with light skiffs and pleasure boats; Vesuvius and Somma receiving the gilded rays of the setting sun, which tinges all the coast of Sorrento

and the island of Caprea, with a pale violet inexpressibly soft and beautiful; Portici glittering in white splendour over the fatal lavas that buried Herculaneum seven times beneath their destructive floods; St Jorio hanging on the venerable sides of the fertile Somma, amid vineyards and groves of citron; the throng of shipping in the mole, whose masts rise like a forest; the crowded Chiaia, the parade of carriages, like one vast procession; the busy Lazzaroni of St Lucia, and the idle herd of soldiers in the opposite barracks; the rich melody of the evening band, whose deep swelling notes seem wafted with the cool breezes from the sea; the currents of liquid lava that course each other down the shaggy cheeks of Vesuvius, and, as the sun sinks lower, assume a brighter hue which, while I write, increases to vivid fire: all these form such a spectacle—so interesting a prospect, and so enlivening a scene, that it baffles all description, unless one's pen possessed the power of pouring forth “thoughts that breathe, and words that burn.”

“July 24, 1793.—While we were at tea in the Albergo Reale, such a scene presented itself as every one agreed was beyond any thing of that kind they had ever seen before. It was caused by the moon, which suddenly rose behind the convent upon Vesuvius; at first, a small bright line, silvering all the clouds, and then a full orb that threw a blaze of light across the sea, through which the vessels passed and repassed in a most beautiful manner. At the same time, the lava, of a different hue, spread its warm tint upon all the objects near it, and threw a red line across the bay, directly parallel to the reflection of the moon's rays. It was one of those scenes which one dwells upon with regret, because one feels the impossibility of retaining the impression it affords. It remains in the memory, but then all its outlines and its colours are so faintly touched, that the beauty of the spectacle fades away with the landscape; which, when covered by the clouds of the night and veiled in darkness, can never be revived, by the pencil, the pen, or by any recourse to the traces it has left upon the mind.” pp. 112, 113.

A very severe disappointment here befell him, the effects of which clouded his spirits for a long time afterwards, and perhaps were not effaced until he accomplished his great expedition. Lord Berwick proposed to him a visit to Egypt and the Holy Land, since become, from the events of the war, frequented countries, and almost brought within the pale of the Grand Tour, but at that time almost as rarely visited as the South Sea islands. It may easily be imagined with what joy this scheme was embraced, and with how much earnestness Dr Clarke devoted himself to make the preparations for the excursion. After five weeks thus spent, and when upon the eve of embarking, his Lordship was necessarily detained by some private business, to expedite which, and the more effectually to secure their departure for the Levant, Dr Clarke undertook to

set out himself for England, and transact the affair which caused the delay. He travelled rapidly home, hardly allowing himself time for rest or refreshment, and, encountering many accidents and even dangers on the road, repaired to Shropshire and finished the business; came back to London, and, when about to set out for Naples, received letters which announced that the plan was abandoned—through the influence, as he believed, of persons unfavourably disposed towards him, and who took advantage of his absence to indispose Lord Berwick towards him. Our Author, however, informs us, that the names of those whom he suspected are carefully erased from his journal, with every allusion to the cause of his disappointment, and that ample justice is done to Lord Berwick's liberal conduct throughout their connexion. With a heavy heart he returned to Italy by the Tyrol, and stopping a few days at Venice, joined Lord Berwick at Naples, and came with him to Rome where he passed the remainder of the winter, and once more journeyed back to England, where he arrived in June. This volume contains several very interesting letters written during the season we have just referred to, and some extracts from his journal. We extract his remarks upon the plain of Lombardy.

“ May 11.—Made a long journey from St Marcello to Rhegio. The first two posts from St Marcello, we ascended the whole way to Bosco-lungò, which is upon the highest part of the Apennines; the snow was still lying upon the tops. From Bosco-lungò, to which place Lord Berwick and I walked, we ran down to Pieve Pelago, and continued along the tops of the Apennines for some time overlooking them all, as upon the waves of a troubled sea. The moment we left Penna di Mazzoni, we beheld the vast extended plain of Lombardy, the finest, the most fertile, of any in the world. It appears exactly like the ocean, and seems to rise from the eye like the sea. Indistinctly, at a distance, we saw the Alps skirting the utmost limits of the plain to the north, and may conceive the rapture of Hannibal and his soldiers, in the contemplation of such an enchanting garden. It may be compared to the delightful residence of our first parents, where the whole is so like a paradise, and the Po and the Tessin emulate the mazy windings of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is laden with the choicest fruits, abounding in corn, oil, and wine; a land flowing with milk and honey. The Campagna Felice, that delightful and fertile spot, is but insignificant in comparison with the plain of Lombardy. But after all this, how melancholy are the reflections that arise in passing over it! The poor peasant of these rich domains, whose cottage is surrounded with all the luxuriance of abundant harvest, whose little garden overflows with the purple vintage of the grape, and who sleeps each night amid the choicest productions of the earth, has not a morsel of

bread to support his children from famine, nor one drop of the wine he gathers to moisten his parched lips. See him, poor unhappy man, without one ray of joy, through all the years of his servitude, to interrupt the continued tenor of despondency ! See how he toils to bring his harvest to perfection, and see him among the foremost in conveying it away to the crowded granaries of his master ! See him busy in clearing away every part of the produce his hand has cherished and brought to perfection, and then see him call together his poor miserable family, and sitting on the bare ground, distribute among them a few crude olives, a hard unwholesome diet, to alleviate the bitter pangs of hunger !

“ No pipe is heard there to gladden the valley, neither is the festive board once cheered by the enlivening accompaniment of the song or the dance. One severe, uninterrupted poverty continues throughout these fertile, luxuriant plains. So unerring are the shafts of despotism, so oppressive their weight, so blighting their influence. Oh happy Britain, these are scenes that make us look to our country with delight ! Throughout all Europe, in all the countries of the world, there is not a people so protected by their laws, and so fortunate in their government as ours. They say living at home fills us with prejudice ; they mistake, it is travelling makes John Bulls of us all. It is experience of the miseries abroad that makes us proud of the blessings at home.” pp. 179—181.

The advantageous comparison of our laws and government with those of the Milanese in 1794, and, we may unhappily add, with the same institutions since the restoration of the detested yoke of Austria suspended every effort towards improvement, is undeniably just ; but where could Dr Clarke have learnt the great superiority which this passage is intended to imply, of our peasantry over those of Italy, in the share that falls to their lot of the ordinary comforts of life ? Assuredly no Lombard lives in a way forming a greater contrast with the abundance that surrounds him, than our labourers in the agricultural districts of England, to say nothing of the still more wretched pittance received by the Irish peasant, who toils for the proprietors, lay and ecclesiastical, of overgrown estates in the most fruitful and most wretched part of the British dominions. Indeed, we need go no further than the volume before us, to find examples within the four seas of the effects produced on the condition of the people, by that greatest of all the political curses which have afflicted humanity, the feudal system. One of the numbers given by way of specimen, of a periodical paper which Dr Clarke carried on for about half a year, under the title of the *Réveur*, was written after passing some time in Wales, as tutor in a family of distinguished worth and the highest respectability ;

and it exhibits the impression made upon his mind by the condition in which he had found the people of the principality.

' The pride of the Welsh is not merely genealogical ; neither is it altogether the result of those feelings, which arise from a consciousness of being the only remaining stock of true Britons. It is in great measure founded upon the arbitrary spirit of the feudal system. That pride, which formerly taught the lord to look down with contempt upon his vassal, still inclines every Welshman to consider himself as a being of a different nature from those whom Providence has placed below him. In fact, almost all Wales is a remnant of the feudal system. Its inhabitants consist of rich and poor, with little or no medium. It is the great man and his dependant, the lord and his vassal.

' The clergy, who in other states form a respectable, and I may add an independent part of society, are by no means of that description in Wales. They are chiefly selected from the lower orders ; from the cottage of the husbandman, or the offspring of the peasant. I make use of the terms *husbandman* and *peasant*, because those who bear the denomination of farmer throughout the country, differ but little from an English day-labourer. They possess a few acres of ground, usually appropriated to potatoes and barley ; with a cottage by no means superior, and frequently inferior, to the little tenement of an English *pauper*. Hence it is, that at the houses of their principal people, the clergy deem it no degradation to associate with the upper servants, to dine at their table, to drink ale in their kitchen, and now and then to be admitted, as a mark of peculiar condescension, to the presence of their master. Their female relations are not unfrequently servants in those families, acting in the capacity of ladies' maids, housekeepers, &c.

' I do not remember to have experienced a greater shock, than I once felt, at sitting down to table with a young clergyman who had been educated at the University, and whose sister acted as servant in the very family with which he was invited to dine. I well knew the master of that family possessed a benevolence of heart, with a degree of urbanity and affability of manners, rarely to be paralleled. It was to me a perfect paradox. More intimate acquaintance with the manners of a people, to which I was then a stranger, has since unravelled the mystery. It was not that a clergyman in Wales was exposed to a trial, which an English clergyman would have been unable to support ; but that the Welsh clergy are a different set of men, and are selected from an order of society, inferior to that class, from which the English usually derive their candidates for holy orders.' pp. 198, 199.

The samples given of this periodical work are calculated to convey a very favourable impression of its merits. The subjects appear to have been principally taken from the author's travels, and to have been handled in a most lively and interest-

ing manner. The grand ceremony of the Papal Benediction, described by so many travellers, we venture confidently to affirm was never so powerfully sketched, or with such picturesque effect, as by Dr Clarke in the following passage.

"We hastened to St Peter's. The concourse was amazing. From the castle of Angelo to the façade of the church, one might have walked on the roofs of the carriages, so closely were they jammed together. This amazing procession seemed to move slowly on like one undivided mass. The foot passengers were exposed to great danger, there being no separate pavement, as in London, appropriated to their use.

"It was a pleasing sight for Englishmen, to behold their Prince the most conspicuous in the middle of this prodigious throng. His Royal Highness Augustus Frederic \* was elevated in his phaeton above them all; while the populace, among whom he is universally and deservedly beloved, rent the air with shouts of—'Viva! Viva! Il Principe d'Inghilterra!'

"Arriving at the *Major Duomo's*, we found a brilliant assemblage of foreigners, in magnificent dresses, mixed with a large party of our own countrymen; who were regaling themselves with chocolate, ices, lemonade, and a profusion of other refreshments. I made my escape as soon as possible through a window, to the roof of the colonnade; and climbing one of those enormous statues which ornament the Peristyle, placed myself above it, like Anchises of old, upon the shoulders of Æneas.

"It is impossible to describe the scene which presented itself before me; and were it otherwise, imagination is incapable of conceiving so sublime a spectacle. The inhabitants of the whole earth seemed assembled in one vast multitude; while the murmur of innumerable tongues, in different languages, ascended like the roaring of an ocean. Confusion could scarcely be greater in the plains of Shinar, when the descendants of Noah fled from the superstructure of their ignorance and folly.—As far as the eye could reach, the tops of all the houses in Rome were laden with spectators. A single square, in the spacious area below, was preserved free from the multitude, by the whole body of the Pope's military, who formed themselves into a quadrangle. Every other spot was occupied; and so closely were the people united, that their heads in motion resembled the waves of the sea. The variety of colours blended together, and glittering in the sun, produced an effect of equal novelty and splendour. It surpassed all I had ever seen or imagined; nor do I believe any country upon the globe ever produced its parallel.

"While I was occupied in the contemplation of this amazing spectacle, a loud flourish of trumpets, from two opposite sides of the area, announced the approach of cavalry. First entered the nobles,

---

\* His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex.

in habits of green and gold, mounted upon sumptuous chargers, who came prancing into the centre of the military quadrangle. Other troops followed; and the whole corps saluting the balcony over the grand portals of St Peter's, from which his Holiness was to appear, arranged themselves in order.

"At this instant a bell tolled; and throughout the whole of that vast multitude, such a silence prevailed, as one would have thought it impossible to produce without a miracle. Every tongue was still, and every eye directed towards the balcony. Suddenly the majestic and venerable figure of the Pope, standing erect upon a lofty and self-moving throne, appeared through clouds of incense burning around him. As he advanced, his form became more and more distinct. All behind was darkness and mystery. The most costly robes decorated his body; a gorgeous tiara glittered on his brow; while enormous plumes were seen waving on all sides of the throne. As he approached the light, with elevated front, and uplifted hands, he called aloud on the Almighty. Instantly the bare-headed multitude fell prostrate. Thousands and tens of thousands knelt before him. The military, with a crash, grounded their arms; and every soldier was seen with his face to the earth. A voice, which penetrated the remotest corner of the area, then pronounced the benediction. Extending his arms, and waving them over the people, he implored a blessing upon all the nations of the earth. Immediately the canons roared—trumpets screamed—music played—all the bells in Rome sounded—the guns from St Angelo poured forth their thunder; more distant artillery repeated the signal; and the intelligence became conveyed from fortress to fortress throughout the remotest provinces of the empire.

"In my life I never witnessed a ceremony more awfully sublime. The figure of a virtuous and venerable man, publicly appealing to Divine Providence for a blessing upon the whole human race, is surely an object of the highest reverence. Add to this, the spectacle afforded by assembled myriads silently and fervently assenting to the supplication; and I think few among mankind, whatever systems of religious persuasion may be acknowledged, would hesitate to join in the solemnity." pp. 204–208.

In the year 1796, a connexion was formed by Dr Clarke with the Paget family, which proved extremely gratifying as well as beneficial to him and his family ever since. He went to reside at Beau Desert, for the purpose of superintending the education of Lord Uxbridge's youngest son, whose health was too delicate to admit of his removal to school or college. Dr Clarke gave himself up to the care of this young man with his characteristic devotion; and when his services as tutor could no longer be of any use from the unhappy progress of his pupil's decline, he continued to watch over him for months, to tend and to nurse him like a parent, administering the medicines which could not

safely be intrusted to less skillful and more mercenary hands and remaining inseparable from his bedside until the fatal termination of the disorder. He afterwards took charge of another son of Lord Uxbridge, the Honourable Berkely Paget, with whom he made a very extensive tour in Scotland and the Western Islands; and whose generous attachment to him not only continued through life, but seemed to gather new strength from the event which is too often found to dissolve all such ties, being transferred, after his death, with the most beneficial effects to his orphan children. A considerable portion of this volume, above 100 pages, is occupied with extracts from the Journal of the Scotch Tour; but we shall not extract any part of these, the subject being extremely familiar to most readers, and late writers, particularly Dr M'Culloch, having handled the more important branches of it with far greater success.

In the spring of 1798, after spending some months most happily if not profitably, where he chiefly delighted to be, in the bosom of his family, he went to reside once more at Jesus College, where he had obtained a fellowship. His studies now assumed a more regular shape, and he associated more with his equals or superiors in knowledge than he had hitherto been used to do, the improvement which he derived was proportionably great. He was upon this occasion accompanied by Mr Cripps, a young gentleman of good fortune, whose education had been neglected, and who placed himself under his care, for the purpose of supplying this deficiency. Being a person of amiable temper and of an enterprising spirit, he soon felt the influence of Dr Clarke's kindred dispositions, and became attached to him for the rest of his life. After remaining above a year at College, they planned, in connexion with two friends, an excursion to the North of Europe, almost the only part of the Continent then open to Englishmen. Those friends were Mr Otter, and a gentleman at that time beginning to be known in the literary world, but whose celebrity has since become great indeed, Mr Malthus. He had then published the first edition of his famous book; and being desirous of obtaining more accurate information with respect to the population of the Northern nations, he devoted to this laudable pursuit the summer vacation of 1799, with what signal success, is well known to the readers of that great work in its more improved form. After landing at Hamburgh the party proceeded to Copenhagen, and thence into Sweden, where they separated at the Wener Lake, Messrs Malthus and Otter not having time to undertake the Lapland journey, which Dr Clarke and Mr Cripps were bent upon performing. To this the intentions of the latter were at first limited, with an excu-



sion to Petersburg; and they reckoned upon being abroad only six or seven months; but led on from place to place, and scheme succeeding scheme, they travelled for three years and a half, visiting the south of Russia, the bordering parts of Asia, Turkey, Egypt, and Palestine. The letters which he wrote on this long and varied expedition were numerous and most interesting; a selection from them forms the most valuable part of the volume before us.

The journey along the Gulf of Bothnia to Tornea, and from thence into Lapland, appears to have been attended with great suffering, from the insects and the changes of temperature, but with still greater from the fatigue to which Dr Clarke, somewhat unnecessarily, submitted, by travelling almost without stopping, day and night. For eighteen days they never were in bed more than four hours in eight and forty; and the consequence was, that although Mr Cripps's youth and greater strength of constitution carried him through safe, Dr Clarke hardly enjoyed a moment's health until his return to Narvèz, was sometimes in considerable danger of losing his life, and probably gave a shock to his frame, which laid the foundation of the maladies he was ever after subject to. In all his sufferings, however, we find him retaining the same buoyancy of spirits, which, if it urged him into perils and discomforts, enabled him easily to live through them. The account which Linnæus gives of his tour over part of the same country (*Lachesis Lapponica*, edited by Sir J. E. Smith in 1811), is full of far greater hardships, because he travelled alone, very slenderly provided, and left the more beaten tracks much more frequently; he encountered, too, some dangers of a serious description. Yet, from the perils and distresses chiefly created by their own imprudence, our travellers suffered much more annoyance, and ran greater risks. The following letter is written to his mother from the extreme point of their northern progress, which his illness, with the lateness of the season, compelled him to terminate here.

" ENONTAKIS, in Lapland, on the frontiers of Finmark, 68° 30' 30" North Lat. In the most northern province of the Swedish Dominions. July 29, 1799.

" We have found the cottage of a priest, in this remote corner of the world, and have been snug with him a few days. Yesterday I launched a balloon, eighteen feet in height, which I had made to attract the natives. You may guess their astonishment, when they saw it rise from the earth.

" Is it not famous to be here, within the frigid zone? More than two degrees within the arctic; and nearer to the pole, than the most northern shores of Iceland? For a long time darkness has been a

stranger to us. The sun, as yet, passes not below the horizon; but he dips his crimson visage behind a mountain to the north. This mountain we ascended, and had the satisfaction to see him make his curtsy, without setting. At midnight, the priest of this place lights his pipe, during three weeks in the year, by means of a burning glass, from the sun's rays.

"We have been driving rein-deer in sledges. Our intention is to penetrate, if possible, into Finmark, as far as the source of the Alten, which falls into the icy sea. We are now at the source of the Muonio, in Tornea Lapmark. I doubt whether any map you can procure will show you the spot. Perhaps you may find the name of the place, Enontakis. Well, what idea have you of it? Is it not a *fine* town?—sashed windows, and streets paved and lighted—French theatres—shops—and public buildings?—I'll draw up the curtain—now see what it is!—A single hut, constructed of the trunks of fir-trees, rudely hewn, with the bark half on, and placed horizontally, one above another; here and there a hole to admit light. And this inhabited by an old priest, and his young wife, and his wife's mother, and a dozen children, and half a dozen dogs, and four pigs, and John, and Cripps, and the two interpreters, and Lazarus, covered with sores, bit by mosquitoes, and as black as a negro. We sleep on rein-deer skins, which are the only beds we have had since Torneå.

"The wolves have made such dreadful havoc here, that the rich Laplanders are flying to Norway. One of them, out of a thousand rein-deer which he possessed a few years ago, has only forty remaining. Our progress from Torneå has been entirely in canoes, or on foot, three hundred and thirty miles. There are no less than one hundred and seven cataracts between this place and Torneå. We live on rein-deer flesh, and the arctic strawberry, which is the only vegetable that has comforted our parched lips and palates, for some time. It grows in such abundance, near all the rivers, that John gathers a pailful whenever we want them. I am making all possible exertion to preserve some for you. Wheat is almost unknown here. The food of the natives is raw fish, ditto rein-deer, and sour milk called *pijma*. Eggs, that great resource of travellers, we have not. Poultry are never seen. Had I but an English cabbage, I should feast like an alderman." pp. 356–358.

There is nothing more amiable in Dr Clarke's character, as presented to us in these letters, than his warm affection for his family, and particularly his mother. This feeling appears with him to have been the most constant and predominating of all. He had left her in declining health; and the alarm which he felt on this account, rendered the separation doubly painful. Being sometimes for months without hearing from her, he seems to have been occasionally in extreme agitation. The following letter is written on his arrival at Christiana, after his Lapland expedition.

“ What treasures I have found here ! No less than four letters from Uckfield ; three from you, and one from Anne. I received them with fear and trembling, and shook so much, I could hardly hold them, till I saw your hand-writing. Oh, blessed news ; and all well ! I tore open the seals, and your last date, which is August 29, tells me George is safe at home, and all well ! So—I am at ease ! thank God ! thank God.—Do not let any body direct the letters but you ; because that alarms me dreadfully. Never mind what you write, your hand-writing is all I want to see, though your letters continue, as they always were, interesting and precious. Your lace, table-cloths, &c. you may depend upon having ; and I wish to buy for you a black silk cloak, lined with such fur, as you once had, on a white satin, that you may not perish in your long penance at church. It shall be handsome, and yet sober and decent ; such as you like.” p. 366.

The winter having hardly set in when they left Stockholm, they expected to cross the Gulf before the ice rendered it impassable. But they were unfortunate in this calculation ; or rather, they were extremely imprudent in going just at the moment, between water and ice ; a fortnight earlier or later would have made their journey comparatively easy and safe. They first encountered a very severe storm in an ill found boat, and were then separated by the Gulf freezing.

“ When I professed my intention to finish this letter at Abo, I was not aware of my own presumption. There was so much delay in our getting a vessel, that it ended with our being detained five days at Grischnamn, by a tempest. On one of these, we were near lost in attempting to leave the place. On the morning of the sixth day, before it was light, the sailors, who belonged to Aland, and were impatient to return, called us, saying that we must go on board with all possible expedition, as the weather was more mild, and the wind somewhat favourable. After what we had experienced before, it was folly to venture again, without a certainty of tranquil seas ; but it was the height of insanity itself, to suffer them to take our heavy carriage in the same boat. Thinking it imprudent to dictate to mariners, I let them have their own way. Now, their boats are not accustomed to take large carriages ; neither are they fit for it. You might as well put to sea in a saucer, and if the saucer is half filled with snow, and very shallow, you will have some idea of the Finland passage boats. The shore is so formed, you can have no knowledge of the weather, until you get clear of the land. The sky looked horribly red in the east, and as black in the west, in which quarter the wind was.

“ The wind gathered additional force each instant as we left the land ; but the wind was nothing compared with our arch-enemy the sea, which having been agitated many days, to the astonishment of the sailors, presented mountains of boiling water. I had once the

misfortune to sail in a storm, off the island of St Kilda, in the Atlantic ocean ; but I never saw such a spectacle as this. I observed the consternation of our boatmen, and you may be sure I felt it. Cripps was in the carriage ; it was no longer possible to conceal our situation. All subordination was lost ; and that fearful confusion, in which men lose all presence of mind, had taken place. I begged they would put back ; but was told that to alter the course of the boat, would ensure her going down. So rapid was the change, that within ten minutes from the beginning of our alarm, all hope was gone. I prevailed on them to take Cripps from the carriage, that he might be lashed to an oar. He was taken out ; but not a hand could be spared to do more. At some distance from our stern, appeared a boat in equal distress ; but so far to the windward, that there was no hope of her venturing down to save us, if the boat went over ; and we have since learned, she had enough to do to bale out the water, which filled every moment on her lee-side. Our boat took in water on both sides, and laboured dreadfully. They began now to reproach us, on account of the carriage. ‘ For God’s sake heave it overboard ! ’ we all exclaimed ; but they assured us, the mere attempt to move it would upset us. Every thing got worse and worse. We had at the helm an experienced seaman, who had taken the management of the vessel from the moment our danger appeared. He advised them to let go the fore-sail, but would not suffer the main-sail to be touched, as we had already fallen too much to leeward, and if we did not keep up to the wind, we should be driven into the Baltic, and inevitably perish. The noise and yelling of the sailors, is still in my ears—crying out, whenever the mountain waves approached. Upon such occasions, they let the vessel fall off with the wave, and she was carried into a gulf of foam, which broke over us, covering all our bodies, and sometimes forced us to quit our hold. At last, every hope seemed to vanish. In despair we clung together upon some sacks, near the stern, and during the short intervals, when the sea left us, had recourse to fervent prayer. It pleased Providence that we should at last escape. What our feelings are, you will better imagine than I can express. I assure you, my blood is chilled with horror, as I now write to you. How we were preserved, I know not. All I recollect of our first glimpse of hope is, that after a considerable time, the island on which the telegraph is stationed, appeared to leeward, at a great distance, under the boom of the main-sail ; but the sea still was in its greatest commotion. Soon after the men began to shout, and we had an island to windward, which afforded us more tranquil water. We then sailed close to land, but it was impossible to reach it owing to the surf.

“ Having cleared these islands, matters went better, and soon after mid-day we arrived at Ekerö.” pp. 374–376.

“ P. S. This is my second letter, and it finds me again at Bomarsund. The north-east raged with unabated fury during thirty-six hours. I had no anxiety, as they assured me the storm would

keep the sea open. Guess my grief and astonishment, when at daylight this morning, I beheld it a solid field of ice, as far as the eye could reach; and all this in one night! God knows when I shall see Cripps again—all communication is cut off: he is on the bleak island of Kumlinge—doubtless in the greatest anxiety. I am alone, without clothes or books. There is a hope, that if this severe frost holds four days, I may walk over to him; the distance is twenty-one English miles. I have already driven a sledge with a horse over the Vargatta and Bomarsund. Cripps has the thermometer; I should think it must be thirty degrees of Fahrenheit, below freezing, as the sea did not freeze at 25.

“Second P. S. I have opened my letter again, to tell you we are safe in Abo; but if I was to tell you all that happened since this was sealed, I must begin a volume. Suffice it to say, that after being a week separated from Cripps, by twenty-one miles of ice, I undertook a circuitous route by the island of Sattunga, and performed a walk of seventy English miles in two days across the sea. The peasants, who were my guides, deserted me in the midst of the ice, refusing to proceed. The cold was so severe, that the exercise of walking alone enabled me to support it. What think you of thirty-nine degrees of Fahrenheit below freezing? Brandy became solid in an instant. At last, more dead than alive, I reached Kumlinge, when all communication with the island was said to be shut. Cripps and I came in open sledges to Abo. On the second morning of our journey, John's face became frozen, and we have been afraid it would mortify. Cripps had two spots in his; and Peter and the peasants recovered their noses with snow. I escaped all these to undergo severer trials. Last night the cold was at 40. Some said the mercury was rendered solid. Cripps and I had closed the stoves. In the night we were seized by convulsions. I lost all animation in my feet, hands, and nose, and it was not till this morning that the circulation of the blood was restored. Cripps is still unwell. A violent headache is all that remains to me. Adieu! After many escapes from death, I still have power to trouble you.” pp. 380, 381.

There was nothing, however, in all these dangers more formidable than the risk of the knout and Siberia, which they ran upon their arrival at Petersburg. ‘Should you like (says he, ‘in one of his letters to his mother, after drawing a kibitki)—‘should you like to travel in one? Because if you come here, ‘it is done in a moment. You have only to sit still in your ‘carriage, whenever one of the royal family passes, instead of ‘getting out and pulling off your pelisse, cloak, great coat, gloves, ‘hat, &c. and you are bundled into a kibitki, and sent to Siberia, with your nose slit. All letters are opened; and if my ‘beautiful drawing was seen by a police-officer, I should visit ‘the mines of Tobolski, with expedition and economy. I think, ‘therefore, it will be as well to wait till our ambassador sends

‘a courier to England, before I dismiss my letter.’ He afterwards complains that he has had a padlock on his lips the whole winter. ‘If I were to relate,’ says he, ‘the ravings, the follies, the villainies, the cruelties of that detestable beast, (meaning his Imperial and Sacred Majesty) I should never reach the end of my letter. The other day the soldiers, by his order, cudgelled a gentleman in the streets, because the cock of his hat was not in a line with his nose.’ Upon another occasion his Imperial Majesty having, in his ride, been passed by a carriage and four, the driver of which knew not in what an august neighbourhood he was, the police officers were instantly despatched after it, and went to the wrong house, where a merchant resided who never drove a carriage and four, nor ever had such an equipage in his yard. His coachman and footman were however flung into prison, and the only answer given to his application for their release was, that, since his carriage was not in fault, he must find out the real offender. The friends of what is called the established order of things, in a word, the supporters of Legitimacy, can of course make no exceptions to their doctrine; and must inculcate as blind a submission to the Pauls and the Ferdinands as to the Catherines and the Josephs. It is fortunate for humanity, that among the founders of the sect, perhaps we ought rather to say its revivers, were found persons disposed to break through their own rule, and, the sacred person of Paul being deprived of life by a simple process, the tyranny of the Government resumed the more mitigated form in which it is still supposed to exist among the Muscovites, and which all good Calmucks, no doubt, consider as the perfection of wisdom, and calculated to secure as great a portion of true practical liberty as men are capable of enjoying with safety to themselves. This event, however, did not occur while our travellers remained in Russia; on the contrary, they suffered every inconvenience that could result from constant restraint and insecurity, during the ten months of their residence in different parts of the empire. The correspondence of Dr Clarke is necessarily cramped during this period, unless when he can send his letters by a courier; but the following is interesting as a sketch of Moscow, drawn at the moment when the impressions made upon the observer were recent and lively.

“You are eager to learn something of this singular city; and I feel happy in giving you that knowledge; because, from our long intimacy, I can make objects familiar to your eyes, which another person might not render visible.

“There is nothing more extraordinary in this country, than the transition of the seasons. We have no spring. Winter vanished,

and summer is ! This is not the work of a week, or a day, but of one instant ; and the manner of it exceeds belief. We came from Petersburg to this place, *en trainau*. The next day, the snow was gone. April the 8th, at noon, the snow beat in at our carriage windows. The same evening, arriving at Moscow, we had difficulty in being dragged through the mud to our inn. The next morning, the streets were bare, all carriages on wheels, the windows thrown open, the balconies filled with spectators, and for several days past, the streets have been dusty, and we have, in the shade, twenty-three degrees of heat of Celsius' thermometer.

" Fortune loves chance, and by one of those chances, we arrived here at the season of the whole year in which Moscow is most interesting to strangers. Moscow is in every thing extraordinary—in disappointing your expectations, and in surpassing them—exciting wonder and derision—pleasure and regret. We are now in the midst of the Pâques ; which is here celebrated with a pomp and festivity unknown to the rest of Europe. The most splendid pageants of Rome do not equal the grandeur and costliness of the church ceremonies ; neither can Venice, in the midst of her carnival, rival in debauchery, and parade, and licentiousness, and relaxation, what is now passing in Moscow.

" I want to conduct you with me to the gates of the town, and thence through the streets. You see its numerous spires glittering with gold, amidst domes, and painted palaces, in the midst of an open plain, for several versts before you reach it. Having passed the gates, you look about, and wonder what is become of the town, or where you are, and are ready to ask ' When shall we get to Moscow ? ' They will tell you, ' this is Moscow ! ' and you see nothing but wide and scattered suburbs, huts, and pig-styes, and brick-walls, and churches, and dunghills, and timber-yards, and warehouses, and the refuse of materials sufficient to supply an empire, with miserable towns, and miserable villages. One might imagine that every town of Europe and Asia had sent a building, by way of representative, to Moscow. You see deputies from all countries holding congress. Timber huts from the north of the Gulf of Bothnia, plastered palaces from Stockholm and Copenhagen (not white-washed since their arrival), painted walls from the Tirol, mosques from Constantinople, Tartar temples, pagodas, and pavilions from Pekin, cabarets from Spain, dungeons, prisons, and public offices from France, ruins and fragments of architecture from Rome, terraces from Naples, and warehouses from Wapping.

" Then you hear accounts of its immense population ; and wander through deserted streets. Passing suddenly towards the quarter where the shops are situated, you would think you could walk upon the heads of thousands. The daily throng is there so immense, that unable to squeeze a passage through it you ask, ' What has convened such a multitude ? ' and are told, ' It is always so ! ' Such a

variety of dresses—Greeks, Turks, Tartars, Cossacks, Muscovites, English, French, Italians, Germans, Poles, &c.

"We are in a Russian inn. The next room to ours is filled by the ambassadors from Persia. Beyond these, lodge a party of Kirghicians, a people yet unknown. Beyond those, a party of Bucharians, and all of them are ambassadors, sent from their respective districts, to treat of commerce, peace, and war, at Petersburg. The Kirghicians and Bucharians I keep at arm's length; but our good old friend the Persian visits us, and we visit him. His name is Oratzai, and I am so great a favourite with him, that he admits me to be present at his devotions, and I see him stand for hours on a carpet, with his face to Mecca, in silent meditation. It is then, he says, he holds intellectual converse with Mahomet. Yesterday he gave me a pair of Persian slippers as a memorial; and I gave him a knife to shave his head with.

"We went at midnight to the cathedral to be present at the ceremony of the resurrection. About two o'clock in the morning the Archbishop, attended by all his bishops and priests, in habits of embroidered satin, covered with gold and silver, and precious stones, bear their consecrated candles to look in the holy sepulchre, and finding that Jesus was risen, announced to the people with a loud voice, 'Xpucmoch, bockpeeb!' that is to say, 'Christ is risen!' and at the delivery of those important words, the signal is given for eating flesh, feasting, drinking, and dancing. To be drunk the whole of Easter week, is as much a religious observance, as to abstain from flesh in Lent; and the Russians are very punctual in religious observances.

"Of course, you saw at Petersburg the Russian priests, in their long black beards, and with their hair flowing in long ringlets, without powder, or quite in straight locks, over their rich robes, and shoulders. No figure can be more respectable than a Russian priest. I look at them, and fancy I behold Moses or Aaron, or one of the high-priests of old, holy men, standing by the tabernacle of the congregation, in fine raiments, the workmanship of "Bezaleel, the son of Uri, the son of Hur, of the tribe of Judah." pp. 398-401.

When Dr Clarke arrived in the Crimea, he was attacked with a severe tertian fever; and owed his recovery to the unceasing care and almost parental kindness of the celebrated Professor Pallas, in whose house he lived for above two months. At Odessa they embarked for Constantinople; and after reaching the mouth of the canal, having delayed to land, owing to a calm that impeded the vessel, and in the belief that all was safe, a hurricane, felt over the greatest part of Europe, came on; they were driven out to sea, and exposed to the most imminent danger. Nor could they reach the port for some weeks, and after encountering a second severe storm. The rest which they enjoyed during the winter at Constantinople restored Dr



Clarke's health. In the spring they visited the Troad, and in the summer Egypt, then the theatre of war, and the Holy Land. A long letter from Jerusalem is greatly praised by Mr Otter, and certainly not more than it deserves; but we cannot afford room for more than a page or two of it. Those who have read Dr Clarke's Travels will recollect that he disputes at length, and with irresistible force of argument, the commonly received tales respecting the Holy Sepulchre. Indeed, of all the writers who have visited Palestine, he is by far the most rational and judicious. It is known that M. Chateaubriand, one of the most recent, with his accustomed accuracy, confounding the parable of the New Testament with realities, tells you where he saw the dwelling of 'the indigent Lazarus;' and on the 'opposite side of the street the residence of the obdurate rich man;' and afterwards, in confirmation of this notion, adds, that the name of the latter has been preserved by the Jews, who called him *Nabal*; and, accordingly, Dr Clarke, in his Travels, shows this to be a common and not a proper name, being the expression to denote a covetous man. Our traveller, however, not only disbelieved the common stories of the Sepulchre, but found, as he contends in his book, the site and remains of the real Sepulchre. The extract which we are about to give, contains his account of this discovery immediately after he made it.

'*Jerusalem, July 10, 1801.—Convent of St Salvador.*

'The date!—the date's the thing! You will thank me for a letter dated *Jerusalem*, more for that little local honour stuck in its front, than for all the fine composition and intelligence it may contain. I hardly yet feel the reality of my being here, and when I reflect, and look back on the many years in which I vainly hoped for this happiness; on the difficulties and dangers I have encountered to get here; on my fatigue, and fevers, and toil; I am ready to sink beneath the weight of an accomplishment, possessing so much influence on my life. For all my hopes centered there—all my plans—speculations—wishes—were concerned in travels; and without visiting Egypt, Syria, and Greece, my travels, however extensive, would have appeared to me to want that nucleus, which, like the heart, is necessary to give life and sensation to the body. If I could repose a little, I should now, I think, be found more quiet for my future life. A stillness must succeed to the gratification of desires which have so long irritated my mind and body. I have done my portion, and am satisfied. If I sit down in Old England's meadows, I may hope to listen no more to schemes of enterprise, but leave it to younger and stronger men to visit those regions, which I have no longer the wish, nor the power to explore.' p. 465, 466

† The absurdity of hewing the rocks of Mount Calvary into gilded

chapels, and disguising the Holy Sepulchre by coverings of marble and painted domes, has so effectually removed or concealed all that might have borne witness to the history of the Crucifixion, that a visit to Jerusalem has often weakened, instead of fortifying the faith of pilgrims; many of whom have returned worse Christians than they came. This may be the case with those, who seek for guidance in the works and relations of ignorant monks; but Jerusalem will be no source of incredulity to men, who, with the Gospel in their hands, and a proper attention to history, tread over the ground, shutting their ears, and opening their eyes.

‘ More pleasing is the prospect from the summit of Mount Olivet, Mount Sion, or the insulated top of Thabor, in the plains of Esdraelon. Thence, all Judea is presented to your view; and such confirmation of the accuracy of the Scriptures, that the earliest records to which history can refer, appear the most authentic. The wild Arab, journeying with his immense family, with his camels, his oxen, his mules, and his asses, is still the picture of patriarchal manners. Customs that were thought peculiar to people who have disappeared in the lapse of ages, characterise, at this moment, the inhabitants of the same countries. Novelty, so adored in Europe, has few charms in Asia. The same habits are transmitted invariably from father to son. A thousand years may pass away, and future travellers find the descendants of Abraham watering their camels by the well of Nahor, while another Rebecca, with the daughters of the men of the city, come down, with pitchers on their shoulders, and draw water from the well; wearing ear-rings of half a shekel weight, and bracelets ten shekels weight of gold. Visiting their tents, he will find a second Sarah, kneading three measures of fine meal, to make cakes upon the hearth, and to offer it for his refreshment beneath a tree, in the plain of Mamre; while Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal king of nations, is at war with Bera king of Sodom, and with Birsha king Gomorrah, Shinab king of Admah, and Shemeber king of Zeboim, and the king of Belar, which is Zoar. Such wars were raging as we passed from Jerusalem to Joppa; and we once saw a circle of such kings and princes, seated on the ground, holding council, whether we should be smitten, as were the Rephaims, in Ashteroth Karnaim, and the Horites in Mount Seir.

‘ But the antiquities to which I particularly wish to call your attention, I found in descending from Mount Sion to the valley of Jehoshaphat. I forget, whether in my letter to you, describing the antiquities in the Gulf of Glaucus, I mentioned some remarkable sepulchres hewn in the rocks there, and which I said so exactly answered the description given of the tomb of Jesus Christ, that I was convinced, could I visit Jerusalem, I should find similar antiquities there. Having visited the sepulchre, supposed to have been that of Christ, I was not satisfied with its appearance. It is now so disguised with marble, that no one can judge from its appearance of its

original state. I found no rock in which it seemed to have been hewn, but its sides were of that sort of marble called verd-antique; and all the rocks of Jerusalem are a very hard limestone. Add to this, it is only forty paces distant from the spot on which they pretend the cross stood; and almost on a level with it, both being beneath the roof of the same church. Finding it difficult to reconcile the topography of modern Jerusalem, and the situation of the places shown there, with its ancient history, I began to extend my researches without the walls. Coming down from the gate of Mount Sion, I perceived the sides of the opposite hill perforated by sepulchres, exactly resembling those among the ruins of Telmessus, in the Gulf of Glaucus, and fulfilling my prediction most completely. One of these, facing Mount Sion, so exactly corresponds with the description of the sepulchre of our Saviour, that you would be at once disposed to pronounce the hill on which it has been cut, Mount Calvary, and this, or at least one of the other tombs, the precise place in which his body was laid. It is hewn in the rock. To look into it, it is necessary 'to stoop down.' (See St John, chap. xx. 5.) The stone which filled its mouth was of such size, that it could only be rolled to its place, and when once there, would have astonished any person to find it had been removed. (Mark, chap. xvi. 3.) It is natural to suppose, that a hill for the execution of malefactors, would be placed as this is, out of the walls of the city. But there is a stronger reason to suppose the body of Jesus was placed there, viz. that exactly upon this mount, and no other, Joseph of Arimathea would construct his tomb. It is this—that from time immemorial, the Karæan Jews (a sect of all others the most correct in the observance of ancient ceremonies, and whose traditions, extending to the remotest periods, are the least corrupted) have been accustomed to bring their dead for interment to this mount. They bury them there at this hour; but having no longer the power to execute such prodigious works of art, are contented to cover the bodies of their relations with more simple works. The present inhabitants of Jerusalem know nothing more of the place; and, though one of the most wonderful works of art which can be found, despise it for two reasons:

"1st,—Because it has not been considered among the number of the holy places.

"2d,—Because it is the Jewish cemetery.

"However, that it was once entitled to more respect, I shall prove, by giving you the Greck inscription which I found on this tomb, and on others, cut above, below, or on one side of the mouths of the sepulchres, in large characters, on the face of the rock."—pp. 467–470.

The inscription is in the character of the lower ages, and runs thus in the ordinary character: *της αγιας Σιωης.*

In the language of this letter there is assuredly no want of a

due tinge of enthusiasm for the subject; and the Book of Travels bears further testimony to the warm devotional feelings of the author; for he there relates, what in the letters he has omitted, that though convinced of the imposture practised on him by the monk who showed the pretended tomb of Christ, he and his party knelt when called upon by the father 'to experience pardon for sin,' and 'participate in the feelings of more credulous pilgrims,'—whereupon a naval Captain, who accompanied him, drew his hanger and placed it on the tomb in token of devotion. It is the more to Dr Clarke's credit that, under the influence of feelings so excited, his judgment was not permanently warped upon the subject of the Sepulchre.

In the summer of 1802, he returned towards England, by way of Vienna, and there received the news of that calamity, the fear of which, as we have seen, so frequently haunted him, his mother's death. This blow, though one for which he must in some measure have been prepared, fell heavily on him. He secluded himself for some time from all society; and when three months afterwards, Mr Otter met him at Paris, he found him still labouring under the effects of his affliction. 'His health was evidently broken by the fatigue and sickness he had encountered in his journey, and his spirits were at times exceedingly depressed by the loss of his mother. It seemed, for the moment, that every tie which bound him to his native land was weak in comparison of that which had just been broken; and his heart, instead of dilating as it was wont to do, at the prospect of the British shore after a long absence, shrunk fearfully within him at the thought of revisiting a country where he had no longer a home to receive him, nor a mother to welcome him. Of his singular affection for his mother, no one who has read his letters will need to be reminded; but it is an act of justice on the part of one who knew her well to state, that her excellent and amiable qualities amply merited all the kindness and attention with which it was repaid.'

He arrived at Cambridge in the latter end of 1802, and continued almost an uninterrupted residence there, and in the immediate neighbourhood, during the rest of his life. For about three years he held the office of senior tutor of Jesus College, and in 1806 he formed a matrimonial connexion with a singularly amiable and accomplished lady, daughter of Sir William Rush, and sister of his friend Mr Cripp's wife. He succeeded to a college living, and to a more valuable family one; and a professorship of mineralogy having been established, it was bestowed upon him, with the general assent of all classes in the University as well as the College; he having for several seasons previously

delivered courses of lectures upon this subject, with great and increasing success.

The cares, public and domestic, which occupied him after his return to Cambridge, postponed the great work of preparing his *Travels* for the press, and it was not till 1808 that he applied himself vigorously to the task. The first volume appeared in 1810, and the other four at different intervals, the fifth being published in 1819. A part only of the sixth was finished by himself, about a third of it being added after his death by his friend Mr Walpole, who had contributed many valuable notes to the former volumes, and whose literary attainments, as well as his *Travels* in the Levant, have acquired him a well merited reputation. He received for the whole work between six and seven thousand pounds. The immediate and decisive success of this work was as creditable to the public as to the author,—for it thwarted many strong prejudices, and flattered none; it called things by their right names, and fearlessly told the truth respecting those Russians whom the political bigotry of the ruling powers in this country had held up as our natural allies against the ambition of *French barbarians*; and it accordingly had all the virulence of the hireling press to contend with. Mr Otter gives some testimonies of private friends, as examples of the praise most grateful to the author which he received from many quarters. We shall extract one of Lord Byron, rather on account of the celebrity of the man than the impartiality of the decision; for the more laudatory of the two letters is obviously in acknowledgment of one as laudatory from Dr Clarke to him.

*‘ From Lord Byron to Dr Clarke.*

*“ St James’s Str t, June 26, 1812.*

“ Will you accept my very sincere congratulations on your second volume, wherein I have retraced some of my old paths, adorned by you so beautifully, that they afford me double delight? The part which pleases me best, after all, is the Preface, because it tells me you have not yet closed labours, to yourself not unprofitable, nor without gratification, for what is so pleasing as to give pleasure? I have sent my copy to Sir Sidney Smith, who will derive much gratification from your anecdotes of Djeddar, his ‘ energetic old man.’ I doat upon the Druses; but who the deuce are they, with their Pantheism? I shall never be easy till I ask *them* the question. How much you have traversed! I must resume my seven leagued boots and journey to Palestine, which your description mortifies me not to have seen more than ever. I still sigh for the *Ægean*. Shall not you always love its bluest of all waves, and brightest of all skies? You have awakened all the gipsy in me. I long to be restless again, and wandering: see what mischief you do, you wont allow gentle-

men to settle quietly at home. I will not wish you success and fame, for you have both, but all the happiness which even these cannot always give."

" Dec. 15, 1813.

" Your very kind letter is the more agreeable, because, setting aside talents, judgment, and the '*laudari a laudato*,' &c. you have been on the spot; you have seen and described more of the East than any of your predecessors—I need not say how ably and successfully; and (excuse the bathos) you are one of the very few who can pronounce how far my costume (to use an affected but expressive word) is correct. As to pocsy, that is, as 'men, gods, and columns,' please to decide upon it; but I am sure that I am anxious to have an observer's, particularly a famous observer's testimony, on the fidelity of my manners and dresses; and, as far as memory and an oriental twist in my imagination have permitted, it has been my endeavour to present to the Franks, a sketch of that of which you have and will present them a complete picture. It was with this notion, that I felt compelled to make my hero and heroine relatives, as you well know that none else could there obtain that degree of intercourse leading to genuine affection; I had nearly made rather too much akin to each other; and though the wild passions of the East, and some great examples in Alfieri, Ford, and Schiller (to stop short of antiquity), might have pleaded in favour of a copyist, yet the times and the north (not Frederick, but our climate) induced me to alter their consanguinity and confine them to cousinship. I also wished to try my hand on a female character in Zuleika, and have endeavoured, as far as the grossness of our masculine ideas will allow, to preserve her purity without impairing the ardour of her attachment. As to criticism, I have been reviewed about a hundred and fifty times—praised and abused. I will not say that I am become indifferent to either eulogy or condemnation, but for some years at least I have felt grateful for the former, and have never attempted to answer the latter. For success equal to the first efforts, I had and have no hope; the novelty was over, and the 'Bride,' like all other brides, must suffer or rejoice for and with her husband. By the bye, I have used bride Turkishly, as affianced, not married; and so far as it is an English bull, which, I trust, will be at least a comfort to all Hibernians not bigotted to monopoly. You are good enough to mention your quotations in your third volume. I shall not only be indebted to it for a renewal of the high gratification received from the two first, but for preserving my relics embalmed in your own species, and ensuring me readers to whom I could not otherwise have aspired. I called on you, as bounden by duty and inclination, when last in your neighbourhood; but I shall always take my chance; you surely would not have me inflict upon you a formal annunciation; I am proud of your friendship, but not so fond of myself as to break in upon your better avocations. I trust that Mrs Clarke is well; I have

never had the honour of presentation, but I have heard so much of her in many quarters, that any notice she is pleased to take of my productions is not less gratifying than my thanks are sincere, both to her and you. By all accounts, I may safely congratulate you on the possession of 'a bride' whose mental and personal accomplishments are more than poetical.

"P. S. Murray has sent, or will send, a double copy of the *Bride and Giaour*; in the last one, some lengthy additions; pray accept them, according to old custom, 'from the author' to one of his better brethren. Your Persian, or any memorial, will be a most agreeable, and it is my fault if not an useful present."

"I trust your third will be out before I sail next month. Can I say or do any thing for you in the Levant? I am now in all the agonies of equipment, and full of schemes, some impracticable, and most of them improbable; but I mean to fly 'freely to the green earth's end,' though not quite so fast as Milton's sprite."—pp. 627–628–629.

The period of Dr Clarke's life to which we have referred, as more or less devoted to the composition of his book, was diversified with many other laborious pursuits. To his Lectures he gave very great attention; no occupation indeed seems ever to have kindled more of his enthusiasm; and so entirely was he at times engrossed with them, that he studied the art of painting in oil for the sake of enabling himself to prepare more accurate representations of his subjects. He published several tracts and papers upon matters connected with mineralogy and antiquities. He composed a great number of sermons, not less than ten of which he preached on public occasions, or in St Marys; and he took a very active and useful part in the controversy respecting the Bible Society, first at the Cambridge meeting held in 1811, where his speech is described as one of the greatest eloquence, and afterwards in promoting the formation of branch societies in different places. But the subject which, during the last five or six years of his life, engrossed most of his attention, was the gas blow-pipe, which he invented, and the experiments which he made by means of it. We have elsewhere treated of this invention, and we must rest satisfied with remarking here, that ingenious as it is, the importance of its results in a scientific point of view, whatever value they may have in the way of amusement, is by no means such as to compensate for the time which he spent upon it, or to justify the almost morbid interest which, toward his latter days, he felt in it. To say nothing of the imminent risks he ran in the course of his experiments, and of which he was warned in vain, until an explosion had well nigh killed himself, an assistant, and two friends. Upon this subject he published about twenty papers, and he dictated the last of

them in bed a few days before he sunk into the stupor which preceded his dissolution. When we call to mind that these pursuits were followed thus intensely, in the midst of much sickness of his family, almost constant recurrence of severe illness in himself; that they never were allowed to interfere with his clerical or his academical duties; that the composition of his great work was all the while going on steadily; and that several other works of a less elaborate description were also given to the world at intervals during the same period,—we may well be amazed at the extraordinary energy of a mind thus able to bear up under so much pressure; but we can hardly wonder that it wore out the ‘over-informed tenement of clay.’ He died on the 9th of March 1822, and was buried in Jesus College Chapel, where a monument is erected to his memory by Master and Fellows.

The circumstances in which he left his family were such as might be expected from a man of his generous and disinterested temper,—one who had held his course straight forward and independent through life,—neither courting the favour of patrons by flattery, nor seeking to turn aside the anger of powerful men by a compromise of his opinions, nor sordidly bent upon accumulating wealth, at the expense of general usefulness and honest fame. Imprudence, or neglect of those dearest to him, he could no way be charged with; but he had not the means of leaving them in affluence; and the kindness of his friends supplied such aid as remained wanting. Among the foremost—we ought perhaps to say the very foremost in these pious offices—stands his reverend, worthy, and intelligent biographer, his intimate friend from early years; and, if his eulogist, yet so judicious and temperate in his praise, that he wins the affections of the reader to his subject, without ever deviating from strict impartiality, or even concealing the little weaknesses which a less honest, or less discreet artist, would shrink from touching. The work which he has thus prepared, and which we have now been occupied with, was undertaken by this excellent man for the benefit of his deceased friend’s family. Too intent upon the subject of it, to pay the execution the attention it so well merits, we have not sufficiently placed Mr Otter’s share in this volume before the reader. We cannot close this article, however, without giving a specimen of his composition; and it shall be part of his concluding summary of Dr Clarke’s character. After remarking that the most prominent features of his mind were enthusiasm and benevolence, he proceeds thus—

‘His ardour for knowledge, not unaptly called by his old tutor, literary heroism, was one of the most zealous, the most sustained, the



most enduring principles of action, that ever animated a human breast; a principle which strengthened with his increasing years, and carried him at last to an extent and variety of knowledge infinitely exceeding the promise of his youth, and apparently disproportioned to the means with which he was endowed; for though his memory was admirable, his attention always ardent and awake, and his perceptions quick and vivid, the grasp of his mind was not greater than that of other intelligent men, and in closeness and acuteness of reasoning, he had certainly no advantage, while his devious and analytic method of acquiring knowledge, involving as it did in some of the steps all the pain of a discovery, was a real impediment in his way, which required much patient labour to overcome. But the unwearied energy of this passion bore down every obstacle and supplied every defect; and thus it was, that always pressing forwards, without losing an atom of the ground he had gained, profiting by his own errors as much as by the lights of other men, his maturer advances in knowledge often extorted respect from the very persons who had regarded his early efforts with a sentiment approaching to ridicule. Allied to this was his generous love of genius, with his quick perception of it in other men; qualities which, united with his good nature, exempted him from those envyings and jealousies which it is the tendency of literary ambition to inspire, and rendered him no less disposed to honour the successful efforts of the competitors who had got before him in the race, than prompt to encourage those whom accident or want of opportunity had left behind. But the most pleasing exercise of these qualities was to be observed in his intercourse with modest and intelligent young men, none of whom ever lived much in his society without being improved and delighted—improved by the enlargement or elevation of their views, and delighted with having some useful or honourable pursuit suitable to their talents pointed out to them, or some portion of his own enthusiasm imparted to their minds. pp. 663, 664.

An account of his exemplary conduct as a parish priest then follows, with some reflexions on the eloquence of his discourses, and the effects they produced; and our author thus paints him in society and in domestic life, with a truth which they who knew him not may almost admit from internal evidence, but which will indeed recall the lamented subject of the picture forcibly and mournfully to the minds of his surviving associates.

‘Of that happy combination of qualities and endowments for which he was so distinguished and admired in general society, enough perhaps has been already said, although it would be difficult to do justice to such a theme. It may be added, however, that though he often gave the tone to the conversation, he was more disposed to bring forward the opinions of other men than to take the lead in it himself, and the genuine delight with which he hailed a bright or good thought from others, was one source of the pleasure which he gave.

' In the bosom of his own family, and in the intercourse of intimate friendship, he was more kind, engaging, and affectionate, than can be well conceived by those who did not know him. It was here that the warmth of his heart, and the cheerfulness of his spirit appeared to most advantage; and though the slightest acquaintance was enough to excite an interest in his behalf, yet the nearer he was approached and the more intimately he was known, the more delightful did he appear. His tête-à-tête conversation with a friend was a perpetual flow of humour, kindness, and intelligence, in which every fold of his heart was laid open, and the confidence and even energies he felt were almost certain to be inspired. It was quite impossible for an intelligent man whom he regarded to be dull in his society, or to have occasion to inquire within himself what he was to say. In fine, all who were closely connected with him must feel that with him one great charm of their existence is gone. In public life his loss will be long and severely felt; in private it is irreparable. In the walks of science his place may be supplied. Another traveller equally patriotic and enlightened may, like him, enrich his country with the spoils of other ages, or of other climes; and his mantle may be caught by some gifted academic, who will perhaps remind his audience of the genius and eloquence they have lost; but the void occasioned by his death in the breasts of his family and friends can never be filled up.' pp. 665, 666.

*No. LXXXVIII. will be published in September.*



THE  
59  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

SEPTEMBER, 1826.

---

---

No. LXXXVIII.

---

---

ART. I. *A System of Phrenology.* By GEORGE COMBE, late President of the Phrenological Society. Second Edition. 8vo. pp. 566. Edinburgh, 1825.

THIS is a long, sober, argumentative exposition of a very fantastical, and, in our humble judgment, most absurd hypothesis. The author, however, is undoubtedly a man of talent as well as industry;—and while many of his remarks indicate no ordinary acuteness, it is impossible not to admire the dexterity with which he has occasionally evaded the weak, and improved the plausible parts of his argument—and the skill and perseverance he has employed in working up his scanty and intractable materials into a semblance of strength and consistency. Phrenology, in his hands, has assumed, for the first time, an aspect not absolutely ludicrous;—and, by retrenching many of the ridiculous illustrations and inconsistent assumptions of its inventors, as well as by correcting its terminology, and tempering its extravagance, he has so far succeeded in disguising its inherent absurdity as to afford a decent apology for those who are determined, or at least very willing, to believe. After all, however, that radical absurdity is so glaring, that in spite of his zeal and earnestness, we really have great difficulty in believing the author to be in good faith with us; and suspect that few reflecting readers will be able to get through the work without many starts of impatient surprise, and a general uneasy surprise that it is a mere exercise of intellectual ingenuity, or an elaborate experiment upon public credulity.

Every one, of course, has heard of Dr Gall's Craniology—and seen his plaster heads, mapped out into the territories of some

thirty or forty independent faculties. Long before this time, we confess, we expected to have seen them turned into toys for children; and this folly consigned to that great Limbo of vanity to which the dreams of Alchymy, Sympathetic Medicine, and Animal Magnetism, had passed before it. But it seems we had underrated the taste for the marvellous which still prevails in the world: For the science, we find, still flourishes in certain circles—and most of all, it would appear, in this intellectual city—where there is not only a regular Lecture on the subject, but a Quarterly Journal devoted exclusively to its discussion, and where, besides several smaller elementary works, this erudite and massive System, of 566 very close printed pages, has come to a second edition in the course of the present year. We do not hear that it makes much way in London or Paris—or even at Vienna or Weimar, where wonders have better fortune:—and as our Northern race has not hitherto been supposed to sin on the side of over credulity, we are really something at a loss, and, to say the truth, less proud than surprised, to find that Edinburgh should be the great nursing mother of this brood of Germany. The phenomenon, we think, can only be solved by the circumstance of a person of Mr Combe's sense and energy having been led, by some extraordinary accident, first to conceive a partiality for it—and then induced, with the natural ambition of a man of talent, to make it a point of honour to justify his partiality. We cannot but wish that it had been directed to a worthier object.

In the very outset of this manifesto, the wonders of Phrenology are gravely and deliberately announced as 'the greatest and most important discovery ever communicated to mankind!' and then follows a very terrible intimation, of the original purpose of its advocates 'to hand down to posterity the names of those who have distinguished themselves by their opposition to it.' In these circumstances, we felt ourselves called on, both by our curiosity, and our gallantry, to look again into the grounds of these lofty pretensions;—and having now done this, very dispassionately, we propose, in spite of the denunciation of immortal infamy, to put briefly on record, a part at least, of our reasons for withholding our assent from them. We do not propose, however, by any means to dissect the huge volume before us, or to enter into any detailed examination of the interminable reasonings it contains. It is filled with elaborate wranglings upon assumptions which we entirely reject, and long statements and explanations addressed only to those who concur in its fundamental positions. Nay, no inconsiderable portion of it is dedicated to the exposition or reconciliation of the schisms which seem already to threaten this in-

fant and infallible church—in balancing the opinions of Gall against those of Spurzheim, or compounding out of them a *tertium quid*, recommended by the authority of Scott or of Combe. All this may be very edifying to the true believers; but to us, who reject the whole revelation in the lump, it is of no interest or importance whatever—and all we have to do is to explain the grounds of our incredulity.

The proposition of the Phrenologists is, as most of our readers probably know, that the degree in which any man possesses any intellectual faculty—moral virtue, vice, or propensity—nay, any animal emotion or power of external sense or perception, or even, as we take it, any acquired habit, infirmity, or accomplishment—may be certainly known by the size of certain protuberances on his Skull: While the only explanation that is afforded of this startling assertion, is contained in the statement, that these bony excrescences indicate and correspond with certain other protuberances on the Brain, which are the natural terminations of *the organs* of the said powers and faculties—and that the powers and faculties themselves exist in a degree of force and perfection exactly corresponding to *the size* of the said organs.

The science which professes to elucidate this ‘great and important discovery,’ is said to be a Science of Observation—and so it is, in an emphatic sense:—seeing that all that is doctrinal about it consists in the foregoing bold asseveration of matter of fact—and that all that can be required to establish it, is *sufficient evidence* of the truth of these asseverations. It might seem easy then at once to determine its claims to our attention, by an examination of that evidence;—and to that issue, no doubt, in one sense, the question must ultimately come. But in almost all such cases, some preliminary inquiries are necessary—and the result of these is often sufficient to supersede any thing else, and to settle the whole controversy. A proposition, in point of fact, may be ambiguous or unintelligible—and, before inquiring how it is proved, we must ascertain whether it has any meaning, and what that meaning truly is. When it is affirmed that certain projections on the skull, or the brain, are the *Organs* of all the *Faculties* and dispositions of the mind, it will not do to proceed at once to the alleged proofs of this assertion; we must first determine what is meant by *organs*, and what by *faculties*, and in what sense these terms are here to be understood. In the same way, an assertion which, when generally stated, may appear susceptible of proof, may turn out, when pursued into its details, to involve contradictions and inconsistencies which render all proof impossible:

Or, though in itself intelligible, and not absolutely contradictory, it may yet be so extremely improbable, as scarcely to justify a serious inquiry—more especially if the proofs by which it is proposed to establish it, are admitted to be of a very slippery and delicate nature, liable to be overlooked or mistaken by unpractised observers, and only to be duly appreciated by those who have studied the subject with the zeal and partiality of devotees. If it were asserted, for example, that every man detected cheating at play would be found to have the figure of a nine of diamonds in the transverse section of the nail of his great toe, we suspect there are not many people who would think it worth while to verify the fact by experiment: But if it were added, that the said figure, though perfectly formed, was to be sure exceedingly small, and not to be discerned but with the aid of a particular glass—and when the section had been made at a particular angle, and the sun was in a certain position—we fancy that the discoverer would be left in the exclusive enjoyment of his creed, and that this ‘science of observation’ would not attract the curiosity even of a single observer. Now, in our view of the matter, this is nearly the case with the kindred science of Phrenology; and these few observations will sufficiently prepare the reader for the leading objections we have now to state against it.

In what sense then, is it said, or how is it proposed to prove, that certain portions of the brain, terminating in bumps on its surface, are the *organs* of different powers or *faculties of the mind*? The only *organs* of the mind of which we have hitherto had any knowledge, are those of the external Senses;—and most certainly those now brought to light by the Phrenologists bear no resemblance, or even analogy, to organs of this description; and can never stand in the same relation to any of our mental powers. The truth however is, not so much that the word is used in a new sense by the Phrenologists, as that it is used without any meaning at all,—and that the familiarity of the term is made to cover and disguise a series of the most extravagant assumptions. It is assumed, first, that the mind is made up of a number of distinct faculties, of the greater part of which no one has any consciousness or perception, and some of them indeed not very conceivable,—then, that these several faculties can only operate through the instrumentality of certain material organs;—next, that though all this is quite certain, and not to be questioned, the mind is all the while utterly *unconscious* of being obliged to act by organs—then, that it is nevertheless indisputable that all these organs are parts of the brain, and nothing *else*,—and, finally, that the force or perfection of every faculty depends entirely on the size of its peculiar organ.

Now, the only organs of which we really know any thing—and the only ones, we humbly conceive, which there is the least reason for supposing to exist in subservience to our mental operations—are, first of all, organs of faculties of the precise nature of which every one is constantly and intensely conscious—they are all exclusively organs of external perceptions, and of the sensations immediately connected with them: The mind is perfect and continually aware of their agency—they are none of them merely parts of the brain—and the strength or perfection of the faculties to which they minister have no dependence on *the size* of these organs. Not only are all these things quite certain, but it is solely on account of some of them, that our external senses have been recognised as organs of perception, sensation, or any other mental affection.

Upon what grounds then can the name of organs be applied to the bumps of the Phrenologists? or in what sense is it really intended that this name should be received in their science? The truth, we do not scruple to say it, is, that there is not the smallest reason for supposing that the mind ever operates through the agency of any material organs, except in its perception of material objects, or in the spontaneous movements of the body which it inhabits;—and that this whole science rests upon a postulate or assumption, for which there is neither any shadow of evidence or any show of reasoning. It is very true, that in our present state of existence, the mind is united, in some mysterious way, to a living and organized body—and that, when the vitality of this body ceases or is suspended, all the functions of the mind, and indeed all indications of its existence, cease and disappear also. Certain actions of the brain, too, we find, are necessary for the maintenance of this vitality—and not of the brain only, but of the heart and of the lungs also; and if any of these actions are stopped or disturbed, even for a moment, the vitality of the body, and along with it, in so far as we can judge, sensation, consciousness, and all other mental operations, are extinguished or suspended. But this, we humbly conceive, affords no sort of proof that the mind, when it is not percipient of matter, acts or is affected by material organs of any sort; and certainly no proof that those organs are in the brain, any more than in the heart or the lungs. If the brain be greatly injured, or strongly compressed, *all* the faculties and functions will, no doubt, be destroyed. But the same effect will follow, and even more suddenly and completely, if the motion of the *heart* be stopped—or the cavity of the *lungs* be filled with unrespirable matter—although the brain remains perfectly sound and unaltered. Insects continue to perform all their functions after their heads are off; and cold-blooded



animals live and move in the same predicament. But let us come back for a moment to the only *organs* of which we really know any thing—the organs of the five external senses.

If the theory of the Phrenologists be right, it would seem to follow, *a fortiori*, *first*, that all these senses must have *organs in the brain*, as well as a connected apparatus or machinery beyond it: And, *secondly*, it is, at all events, a fundamental point in their creed that the mind is *not* in any way conscious, or aware, even as to them, that it acts by means of organs having any locality at all. Now the first and most plausible of these propositions they have themselves been forced to abandon;—and both, we humbly conceive, are not only gratuitous, but, in any sound sense, entirely unfounded and erroneous.

We see with our eyes, hear with our ears, and touch with our hands, or the surface of our whole body. These are facts, we think, which may be assumed without argument or explanation. Anatomy and experiment show farther, that the sensibility of these organs depends on *the nerves* which belong to them—on the optic and auditory nerves, for example, as to seeing and hearing, or on the nerves of touch for many other sensations: And it also appears, from the same experiments, that all these nerves terminate or originate in the brain,\* and that if their connexion with the brain be cut off, they no longer perform their functions. This last fact proves, then, that a connexion with the brain is necessary to preserve these nerves in a proper state of vitality; but it does not prove that there is any particular part of the brain which is appropriated for this purpose; and still less that such a portion of brain is, either with or without the connected *nerves*, the material organ of sight, hearing, or touch. The *nerves* belonging to each of these senses seem, on the contrary, to form its only material organ; since, without them, whatever be the state of the brain,

---

\* The nerves of touch originate, partly at least, in the spinal marrow, which is in some sense an elongation of the brain, and performs similar functions. The very ingenious experiments and speculations of Mr Charles Bell, followed up as they have been by those of Messrs Magendie and Flourens, have thrown a new and interesting light on the whole theory of the nervous system. They seem to render it at least highly probable, that each nerve, or set of nerves, performs only a single function—that those which minister to Sensation, for example, are different from those which produce voluntary Motion—and that the involuntary motions attending such functions, as respiration, &c. are performed by the instrumentality of a third set. There is nothing, however, in these speculations which at all interferes with the argument in the text, or affords any countenance to the strange attempt to assign material organs for such purely mental operations as have no immediate reference to matter.

we can neither see, hear, or feel—and it is upon *their* peculiar structure or action that our sensations depend, though a connexion with the brain be necessary to maintain their capacity of action. Accordingly, it is very remarkable, that even Mr Combe has assigned no cerebral organ to any of the five senses!—and Spurzheim, as he quotes him (p. 268), has said distinctly, that he ‘sees no reason to suppose that the functions of the ‘external senses require a particular portion of brain for their ‘determinate sensations’—a concession which we must own surprises us not a little, in a philosopher of this school—since, if the mind really performs all its other functions by means of portions of the brain, there was still stronger ground for supposing that its external perceptions depended on parts of that substance, in which the nerves of the senses originate. The true phrenologist, however, seems to disdain all approach to ordinary probabilities in his doctrine; and accordingly, though there are organs relating to the objects of sight and of hearing in their arrangement, they are ingeniously placed at a distance from the terminations of the optic or auditory nerves,—the organ of colour being in the forehead, and that of tune on the eyebrow!

But they are all agreed, it seems, ‘that the mind has no ‘knowledge either of the existence of the organs of sense, or ‘of the functions performed by them,’ (p. 267.) This, to most people, will probably appear more surprising still. Is it meant to be said that we do not know, certainly, naturally, and immediately, that we see with our eyes, and hear with our ears, and feel with that part of our bodies on which an external impression is made? Is it by a course of experiments and observations that those recondite truths have been discovered? Did they remain hidden from mankind during the lapse of many ages, till some former Gall or Spurzheim, by a gigantic effort of intellect, revealed the wonderful secret to his admiring contemporaries? When a man is struck hard on the hand, does he not instantly refer his sensation to that part of his body?—When he is dazzled with excessive light, does he, in any state of his reasoning or experience, stop his ears instead of closing his eyelids? When stunned with noise, does he, in his most infantine condition, ever take his chance of excluding it by turning away his eyes? We know there is a metaphysical subtlety as to the proper province of *consciousness*, and the want of *locality* in the notion of mere *sensation*, by which the language at least of this part of the discussion may be perplexed. But it can never touch, or at all affect, the palpable fallacy of the allegation we are now considering, with reference to its intended application. We will not dispute about words. If there be any objection to saying that we are *conscious that our*

perceptions of external objects are derived through our five external senses, we shall be contented to say that we universally, naturally, and immediately *know* and *feel* that they are so derived. Whether this knowledge be obtained by an observation and comparison of the intimations of the different senses, or be directly involved in the operation of each, is really of no consequence to the argument before us. The true question upon either supposition is, whether, knowing and feeling, as in one way or other we do with the most perfect distinctness, that we see with our eyes and hear with our ears, and that it is by those organs alone that the mind performs those functions, it can be truly, or even intelligibly said, that we are as little aware of acting by material organs when we so see or hear, as we are that we love our children by a bump on the back of the head, or perceive the beauty of music by a small protuberance in the middle of the eyebrow? Can any experience or observation, any comparison or combination of the intimations of different faculties, give us such an assurance of those latter facts, as we all have, without experience, thought, or observation at all,—that we do see with our eyes, and hear with our ears—and that when we are wounded on the right arm, it is there, and not on the left leg, that the blow has been inflicted?

In this most material and decisive particular, then, the supposed organs of the Phrenologists differ entirely from the actual and acknowledged organs of the external senses. All mankind know and feel that the latter are the material instruments by which external objects operate on the mind; but nobody knows or feels—and not many people can even fancy—that the mind makes any use of the others. And indeed, while it is natural, and perhaps *necessary*, to suppose that there should be *material organs* to connect the mind with *material objects*, there is plainly no such probability or necessity, that these faculties and sentiments which do not relate to matter at all, should yet act only by the instrumentality of local and material organs. There is another distinction, too, between the actual and the supposed organs, to which we have already alluded, which seems to be equally conclusive against the peculiar theory of the Phrenologists. The organs of the external senses, the only material organs which the mind is known to employ, are admitted *not* to be parts of the brain; although all the nerves through which they act may be traced into that substance; and depend on their immediate connexion with it for their vitality. The whole of the faculties to which they are subservient therefore may be said, in one sense, to be connected with the brain, and to depend on it for the *means* of their exercise. But the faculties to which the phre-

nological organs are supposed to minister, have no perceptible or intelligible connection with the brain, more than with any other part of the living body. They are, many of them, mere sentiments or contemplative faculties, that have no relation to any thing extrinsic or material—such as, Veneration, Concentrativeness, Adhesiveness, and others; while those that have a reference to external objects, are of a nature that would lead us to look for their physical organs any where but in the brain—the appetite, for instance, of the sexes—those of thirst and hunger, or the capacity of being hot or cold. Nay, even as to those that are conversant about the immediate and appropriate objects of the five external senses, it is pretty plain, that if the senses themselves, the nerves of which terminate in the brain, are yet without organs in any part of it, those related faculties, if indeed they have any existence, are still less likely to be so provided. If the sense of *seeing* have no cerebral organ, is it at all to be presumed that the faculty of distinguishing *colours*, which the Phrenologists assure us is quite a different thing, should have such an organ—and that too quite apart from the region of the optic nerve? If it be admitted that we do not *hear* by means of an organ in the brain, is it a probable surmise that we distinguish *tunes* by one that projects over the middle of the eye?

These last considerations lead us naturally to another class of objections, which, we confess, have always appeared to us of themselves conclusive against this new philosophy—those we mean which apply to the strange apparatus of separate faculties and sentiments into which it has parcelled out and divided the mind.

We are a little jealous of the word *faculties* in any philosophical discussion. The mind, we take it, is one and indivisible:—and if, by faculties, is meant parts, portions or members, by the aggregation of which the mind is made up, we must not only deny their existence, but confess that we have no great favour for a term which tends naturally to familiarise us with such an assumption. What are called faculties of the mind, we would consider as different *acts*, or rather *states* of it. But if this be the just view of the matter, it is plain that it renders it in the highest degree improbable, if not truly inconceivable, that those supposed faculties should each have a separate material organ. The whole body may, in a certain loose sense, be called the organ of the whole mind;—nay, if any one, in consideration of its peculiar importance to vitality, and of its necessary connexion with all the nerves of sensation, should insist on giving this name to the whole brain, we do not see that it would be worth any body's while to gainsay him. But it really is

not very easy to understand how there should be an external organ for *every particular act* or state of the mind—or rather for an arbitrary member of these states: And when the question is about the existence of some thirty or forty separate *organs* in distinct regions of the brain, it is absolutely necessary to inquire what proof there is of the existence of the thirty or forty separate *faculties* to which they are said to minister,—or rather, we think, which they are held to create—*or upon what grounds they have been limited to that precise number*: And here again we must refer, as to the only fixed or certain point in the discussion, to the functions of our external senses, and their known organs.

By that example it is no doubt proved, that certain faculties or states of the mind have material organs; and why, it may be asked, should it not be inferred that other faculties may have them also? We answer, *1st*, That we believe the functions of seeing and hearing, &c. to be carried on by material organs, *only* because we know and feel that they are so—and that we do *not* believe that the mind performs its other functions by a like machinery, *because we do not know or feel* any thing analogous in their operations. If the mind, in comparing or resenting, made use of certain organs in the head, just as it does in hearing and seeing, we cannot but think that the fact would be equally certain and notorious; but, as we know or feel nothing at all analogous, we cannot believe that any thing of the kind takes place. *2d*, All the organs which we actually know to be used by the mind, are used to connect it with material and external objects; and indeed it is difficult for us to conceive how we could ever have become acquainted with such objects, except by means of a material apparatus in our living bodies. But the other functions of mind do not so connect us with matter—and therefore, there is not only no such reason for supposing their existence, but there is a corresponding difficulty in the conception. *3dly*, And this is what chiefly concerns our immediate argument, all those functions which operate through the organs of sense, are of a definite and peculiar nature, and so totally unlike those which the Phrenologists would furnish with like instruments, as to make the inference of their being actually so furnished in the highest degree improbable and extravagant. By the eye we receive sensations or ideas of light only—by the ear of sound exclusively—by the palate of tastes, and so on. Each of these classes of ideas or sensations is completely original, and perfectly distinct from the others—incapable of being mixed up, or in any way compounded with them, and in truth completely independent either of their existence, or of any other existence *whatsoever*. Our perception of sounds, for example, is quite

independent of our perception of colours, odours, or tastes, and would be precisely what it is, though none of these perceptions, or the objects of them, existed in the universe. It is in truth this palpable separation and *independence* of these different classes of sensations, which leads us to describe the capacity of receiving them as a separate function or faculty of the mind; and in this way it is obvious, that our knowledge of the organ is *antecedent* to our knowledge of the faculty, and that it is truly by reference to the former, that the latter is recognised and determined. The best definition of the faculty of seeing is, that it is that faculty which takes cognisance of the impressions transmitted by the eye, or that state of the mind which is induced by the reception of such impressions; and parallel definitions will be found to comprise all that we really know of all the other faculties that work by external organs.

In all these respects, however, the case of the imaginary faculties of the Phrenologists is not only in no degree analogous, but directly the reverse. As to these, it must be admitted that we have no antecedent knowledge of the existence of any material organs,—and the existence of the faculties therefore must be assumed on quite different *data*, if it is not rather imagined without any reason at all,—while, so far from supplying original, definite, and independent impressions, the greater part of those phrenological faculties presuppose the existence of such impressions, and seem to have little other function than to modify or direct the functions of other faculties. Thus, love of Approbation presupposes an habitual communication of sentiments with other men,—Veneration, a custom of observing and comparing the powers and qualities of different beings,—Acquisitiveness, the general development of the idea of property—and Cautiousness, an experience of the occasions and consequences of many forms of danger:—and all of them, in short, are so far from resembling primitive and independent faculties, operating through separate organs, and provided each with its own material apparatus in the brain, that we cannot even conceive of their existence till society has made a considerable progress, various tastes and habits been cultivated, and much knowledge been accumulated and diffused. How, then, is it possible to say that any of these is a primitive and independent faculty like seeing or hearing, or any of these that work through outward organs? What primitive or independent sensations or ideas, for example, are supplied by Acquisitiveness? Can *they* be conceived to exist, although all other faculties were annihilated? Are *they*, in this respect, or indeed in any other, on a par with the ideas supplied by sight or hearing?—they, that plainly could not come into existence till men had entered into all the competitions of

society, and become familiar, not only with innumerable external objects, but with their several utilities and values !

It is, if possible, still worse with such pretended faculties as Concentrativeness, Adhesiveness, or Ideality,—which seem, in so far as we can at all comprehend their definition, to be little more than *intensatives* of other faculties or capacities—from which however, they are here totally disjoined. Concentrativeness, it seems, is that power or propensity by which we are led to persist in any methodical or intellectual effort in which we take an interest; and it has two distinct organs of an angular shape on the sides of the cranium. This we think is like saying, that besides the simple faculty of seeing, no right thinking man can doubt that we are also provided with an entirely separate and independent one, without which we should never be able to look *long or steadily* on the objects which are presented to our sight,—and that it is quite reasonable to believe that this faculty acts by a material organ, somewhere on the outside of the brain, but totally apart from the eye ! Adhesiveness is a still stronger case, we think, of absurdity. It also is a separate and independent faculty,—and its function is to make us constant and pertinacious in our attachments. Our love, considered simply as love, may be strong or weak, sober or frantic, grave or gay. All that depends of course on the shape and size of its own peculiar organs ; but its *constancy* is the concern of an entirely different faculty, which has a goodly organ of its own in another region of the skull, and has no more connection with it, physically or metaphysically, than smelling has with seeing. Ideality, again, is something still more mystical and hard to be defined. It is the faculty by which we make metaphors, and endite poetry, and feel enthusiastic,—of course, beyond all question, a separate, primitive, and simple faculty of the mind—working necessarily by two large protuberances at the outer angle of the temples, and noway affected by education, ambition, or the habits or history of the individual or the age !

To the intelligent, these suggestions will probably be more than enough. But to enable our less studious readers to judge correctly of this fundamental part of the phrenological system, the fairest and best way is to compare, in one or two particular points, their new theory and distribution of the faculties, with that which has hitherto prevailed among our metaphysical and popular writers, and which it has pleased these grand discoverers to pursue throughout with the most unmeasured contempt. We are ourselves no great sticklers for the value or the soundness of most metaphysical dogmas. But there is a difference, after all, between subtlety and mere nonsense—between ingenious suppositions, and impossible or unintelligible asseverations.

There is for example a principle, or at all events an occasional feeling, which is called Benevolence—a sympathy with the happiness of others—which some of our old philosophers considered as an ultimate fact or law of our constitution, and others sought to resolve into a complacent recollection of our own happiness, and an habitual conviction that it was best promoted when linked to that of all around us. But however that might be, they were all pretty well agreed that it was this same principle that was in every case at the bottom of our regard and affection for sentient beings of all descriptions; though it was variously modified by a consideration of the different qualities of the objects to which it was directed, and the different relations in which they might happen to stand to us:—And when their attention was called to the distinctions that might be pointed out between the kind of love they bore to their children and that they felt for their parents—or the attachment they cherished to their young female friends, as compared with their ancient male ones—or to the worthies of their own country, and those of foreign lands—or to inferiors and superiors, of their own or of other races, they thought all this pretty well explained by saying, that it was the general benevolent feeling—modified, in the case of children, by a sense of the weakness, innocence, and dependence of their condition; in the case of parents by respect for their experience and authority, and gratitude for the obligations they had conferred; in the case of young women, by emotions of sex; of our own countrymen, by the associations of patriotic partiality; and, in all cases, by the peculiar habits, tastes, and opinions to which the individual had been trained, by the education either of his preceptors or his society. With regard to the Constancy of these attachments, again, that was generally supposed to depend partly on the judgment or deliberation with which they had been formed, and partly on what might be called the firmness or gravity of the character to which they belonged. A man who was steady in his other pursuits was thought likely to be steady in his friendships, and one who was constant in his principles and opinions, to be constant also in his loves.

We do not mean to say that there was any thing very oracular or profound in this plain exposition of very familiar phenomena. On the contrary, its chief merit is, that it amounts to little more than a verbal statement of what every one must feel to be true. The Philosophy of Mind, we cannot help thinking, should be confined very much to its Natural History; and, instead of attempting to explain facts, which must ultimately be left inexplicable, our ambition might be advantageously limited to their clear enumeration. The old theory, to which we have



alluded, trespassed little on this maxim. In referring the common feeling of love or affection to one principle or capacity of our nature, it follows the great rule of philosophizing without unnecessary multiplication of suppositions, as correctly, as it adheres cautiously to observation and common sense, in explaining its subordinate variations by causes which cannot be overlooked.

In the eye of the Phrenologist, however, all this is mere drivelling and childishness. Benevolence, in general, is with him quite a different faculty or sentiment from love of women, or love of children!—as different as seeing is from hearing or smelling. It is ascertained accordingly, he tells you, that they have separate and distinct organs in the brain;—benevolence operating through a triangular bump on the upper part of the forehead—the love of children through a large roundish swelling on the hinder part of the skull—and love proper having its seat just above the nape of the neck! The constancy of these attachments, again, is a thing, we are assured, quite distinct from the attachments themselves. It is a separate and independent faculty of itself, to be known hereafter by the name of Adhesiveness; and may be found operating at any time through two oval protuberances on the posterior part of the cranium. We must take great care, however, not to imagine, that this adhesiveness has any thing to do with firmness of character in general—with perseverance in intellectual pursuits, or constancy to party or principle. Such an approximation to common sense would be a sad dereliction of phrenological originality. Adhesiveness is a faculty created expressly for keeping us steady in our personal attachments. Firmness, in general, is a totally distinct faculty; and has its organ, accordingly, on the very apex of the skull—while there is still another primitive faculty which helps to give intensity and vigour to the acts of the understanding, under the name of Concentrativeness—working by a large organ placed on the back of the head, between maternal love and vanity!

In like manner, Memory, upon the old system, was always regarded as one of the most distinct and observable faculties of our nature. In particular instances, it was held to depend very much on the degree of attention that had been given to the original impression; and as a general faculty, though different individuals were thought to possess it in different degrees, it was allowed to be capable in all cases of great improvement by exercise, and seldom to fail remarkably, upon subjects that had excited a great and habitual interest. It was supposed, in short, that there was such a thing as a good memory in general, depending for the most part on habits of attention and animated observation; and although it was no doubt observed, that some per-

sons had a memory for dates, and others for stories, and others, again, for places, faces, or theories, it certainly did not occur to any one, that these were all separate and distinct faculties—and still less that there was no such power or faculty as memory at all, but that our recollection of past impressions was just a part of the same function by which we received them, or were led to take pleasure in them. Our old observers, speculating with a timid adherence to facts and common sense, were weak enough to suppose that they had explained the varieties of memory that were found to occur among men, by referring them to the obvious circumstances in the history or condition of each individual, which had recommended particular subjects to his notice and consideration. Sovereigns, who held levees and distributed notices in the circle, were found to have a singularly accurate recollection of faces and proper names—just as shepherds who had to separate their flocks on the mountains, had a miraculous memory for the countenances of the sheep that composed them—while savages, who pursued their sport or warfare through trackless forests, had a strange memory for paths and places—and idle and opulent old gentlemen, for long stories and tiresome anecdotes of individuals.

This was homely enough philosophy, it might be—and did not give any very deep insight into the nature of memory in general. But it was sound so far as it went; and was commonly thought to go almost as far as the nature of the subject, and our wants and faculties admitted. In the fulness of time, however, comes Phrenology, with a new and marvellous revelation; and it is curious to observe by what fine gradations the mighty truth was at last evolved. The first discovery was—not that memory was no faculty at all—but that it was several separate and distinct faculties! that there was a memory for places, and a memory for words, and a memory for things in general; and that each of these was an independent and original faculty, and had a material organ, and several section of the brain set apart for its peculiar use;—a discovery no less wonderful, we think, than it would be to announce that the faculty of seeing flowers was quite a different thing from that of seeing stones or stars; and that the organ of the one kind of sight was in the forehead, and of the other in the palm of the hand. Such, however, was the state of the science, when we first approached its mysteries, some twenty years ago, in the publications of Dr Spurzheim. All this, however, we are happy to find from Mr Combe, has now been discarded. The organs of local memory and verbal memory have been discovered to be the organs of Locality—whatever that may mean—and of Language respectively; and it has been ascertained, that there is no such facul-

ty as Memory at all, and, of course, no part of the brain, or even of the skull, appropriated to the use of that imaginary function. It is merely, it seems, 'a certain state of activity' of certain other faculties: and the nature of it is oracularly explained by Mr Combe, when he assures us, that 'the organ of Tune will recall notes formerly heard, and give the memory of music. Form will recall figures formerly observed, and give the memory of persons, pictures, and crystals; and Individuality will give the memory for *facts*, and render a person well skilled in History, both natural and civil!' This is perfect; and, of course, leaves nothing to be desired;—and it follows by necessary consequence, that it is by the nose we *remember* smells, and by the eye that we have memory of colours.

Can it really be thought necessary to inquire into the alleged *proofs* of propositions so manifestly preposterous? And is not the absurdity of their Metaphysics sufficient to excuse us from any examination of the *Evidence* relied on by the Phrenologists? If any man can believe that there are, or can be, so many distinct powers and faculties as we have now referred to, he may possibly be justified in seeking to be satisfied as to the existence and locality of their material organs. For ourselves, we see no occasion to go farther.

But in reality, this inconceivable multiplication of original and separate faculties, affords, after all perhaps, a weaker argument against the truth of the phrenological system, than their unaccountable limitation does against its consistency. If their principles are right, the number of our faculties and organs ought truly to be infinite. The great boast of their philosophy is, that it does not rest on fantastical and arbitrary abstractions, but on a correct observation of the varieties of actual character—and is applied, not to a mere speculative and shadowy analysis of supposed qualities, but to the undeniable realities by which men are distinguished in common life. It takes no cognizance of such questionable existences as perception, memory, imagination, or judgment; but looks at once to the peculiarities by which the conduct and characters of men in society are marked to ordinary observation; and, referring them as far as possible to primitive and original differences, endeavours to discover whether they are indicated by any external peculiarity of organization. Thus, it finds one man actuated in all his conduct by a strong desire of fame—and immediately it sets down 'love of Approbation,' as an original principle in our nature, and looks about for a bump on some vacant part of the skull, by the size of which the strength of this propensity may be measured. Another is distinguished by his love of money—and so **Acquisitiveness** is established as a primitive and inherent pro-

pensity ! Another is a great talker—and forthwith Language is made a distinct and independent faculty ; another has a turn for making nut-crackers and mouse-traps—and what can be so natural as to refer this to the bulk of his organ of Constructiveness ? another shows a great love for children—without indicating much benevolence to any grown creature ; and nothing consequently can be plainer than that Philoprogenitiveness is an original sentiment. Some are quick at arithmetical operations—and what explanation can be so satisfactory, as that they have the faculty of Number very prominent ? others remember all the cross-roads they have ever come through—and who can deny, therefore, that they are distinguished for their Locality ? some keep their papers, clothes and furniture, very nicely arranged—which can be attributed only to the degree in which they possess the faculty of Order ; while there are others again, at least so Mr Combe assures us, whose genius consists in a peculiarly quick observation of the *Size* and *Weight* of external substances—for whose sake accordingly it has been thought reasonable to create the special original faculties—of *Size* and *Weight* !

This, we must admit, is sufficiently simple and bold. But where is it to stop ? If we are thus to take all the tastes, habits, accomplishments, and propensities by which grown men are distinguished, in the concrete, and forthwith to refer them to some peculiar original faculty or principle, imagined for the mere purpose of accounting for them, the 36 original faculties of the phrenologists may at once be multiplied to 360 or 36000—and room must be made upon the skull for as many new organs. Some men have a remarkable love for their children—and therefore we have a separate principle of *Philoprogenitiveness*. But other men have as remarkable a love for their parents—and why therefore should we not have a faculty of *Philoprogenitorness*, with a corresponding bump on some suitable place of the cranium ? The affections of others, again, are less remarkable in the ascending and descending lines, and spread most kindly in the collateral ;—Can it be doubted, then, that we should have a Philadelphic principle, to attach us to our brothers and sisters,—and another to keep us in charity with our first cousins ? If the fact, that some men are distinguished for their love of Wealth, is a sufficient ground for assuming that Acquisitiveness is an independent and original principle of our nature, should not the fact of other men being distinguished for their love of Dogs and Horses justify us in referring this also to an inherent principle ?—or upon what grounds can we refuse the same ho-

nour to the love of card-playing, gossiping, or agriculture? Some men—nay some whole families, are notorious for lying—though addicted to no other immorality; some—the natural prey of the former—are proverbial for credulity—some for inordinate merriment and laughter—some for envy—some for love of society—some for telling long stories—some for love of noise—some for their horror of it. Most of these, it appears to us, are quite as well entitled to the rank of primitive faculties or propensities, as any on the list of the Phrenologists. Undoubtedly they mark as conspicuously the character and manners of the persons to whom they belong, and are not in general so easily resolved into more general principles. Why then should they be excluded from the scheme of the Phrenologists, and left without any organs, in their improvident distribution of the skull? Nay, upon these principles, why should there not be a separate original faculty prompting us to the practice of skating, sailing, or planting?—or towards the study of botany, mineralogy, anatomy, bookbinding, chemistry, gymnastics—or any of the other five hundred pursuits to which idle men are found to betake themselves, with an engrossing and often passionate partiality?

It is quite as true of all these, as of the love of money, or of order, or of children, or of mechanics, that they are what practically distinguish the habits and character of men in society; and if we are not allowed to analyze or explain these propensities, either by resolving them into more general principles, or tracing them back to such accidental causes, as imitation, fashion, or education, they seem quite as well entitled to the honour of original principles of our nature, as most of those to which we are now required to concede it. It is no less true of them, too, that, when the habit, taste, or propensity is once acquired, it does indicate a certain state of mind, by which the individual is truly characterized; and, for any thing we can tell, some peculiar original aptitude for its acquisition. But then, this is as obviously true of the most insignificant, recent, and transitory, taste, trick, or habit, by which any one ever rendered himself ridiculous or remarkable. A taste for French wines, or black tea—for puns or charades—for pugilism, genealogy, prosody, whizzigs, or fish sauces—all mark a man's character and manners, while they last—and may all be said, in one sense, to proceed from a certain state of his mind, or balance of his powers and faculties. But is this a reason for assuming the existence of a primitive and separate faculty, common to all mankind, for every such trick or propensity? Or is it not quite manifest, that such a supposition is as much op-

posed to the first rules of philosophizing as to the plainest dictates of common sense?

It is the peculiar business of philosophy, as it has hitherto been understood, to explain detached phenomena, by referring them to general laws; and then, if possible, to resolve the first laws so determined, into others still more simple and comprehensive. In metaphysical inquiries this is not perhaps so easy as in the sciences conversant with matter; but the course to be pursued is, at all events, indicated with sufficient clearness; and, till the advent of the Phrenologists, no one ventured openly to desert it. The problem always has been, with how few primitive faculties intellectual phenomena could be explained. Some bolder spirits were of opinion, that the work might very well be done with the Perception of external objects, sensations of Pleasure and Pain, and the Memory of them; while others required the instrumentality of several other agents. But it certainly never occurred to any body, till the late revelation, that the primitive faculties might be multiplied on the principle of the Phrenologists, and that the consummation of philosophy was to account for every separate propensity, taste or talent, that a man had acquired, by setting it down to the predominance of some imaginary original faculty—created for the express purpose of accounting for it!

To what absurd and extravagant multiplication of the faculties this principle unavoidably leads, we have already endeavoured to show; and it is not necessary to go beyond some of those we have been led incidentally to mention, to prove on what shallow and preposterous grounds they have been assumed as primitive qualities of our nature. Because avarice is a vice of pretty common occurrence, it is raised into an original attribute of our nature, by the name of Acquisitiveness—which all men have in some degree, and the avaricious in excess. Now, as this acquisitiveness is merely the desire of possessing *things useful or agreeable*, what necessity can there be to suppose any other faculty than that of perceiving what is useful and agreeable, to account for such a desire? A man who has suffered from the want of food or clothing, or enjoyed the timely supply of them, cannot well recall either of those sensations, without wishing at all times to possess a sufficiency of those valuable articles,—and to provide a separate sense or faculty merely to enable him to form such a wish, really seems to us as wasteful an exercise of creative power as we recollect ever to have met with, even in the prodigalities of poetry. Can any one really doubt that wealth is desired as the *means* to an *end*?—and if the end—which is comfort, influence, and security—is undeni-

ably desirable, is it not utterly preposterous to invent a separate principle to explain how the means should be desirable also? At this rate, we should have one faculty in our nature which led us to wish for warmth in cold weather—and another, quite separate and independent, which taught us to set a due value on coals!

If the principle itself be plainly a necessary result of experience and observation, the cases of its excess can of course occasion no difficulty—although nothing can illustrate more strikingly the dull dogmatism which the Phrenologists would substitute for philosophy, than to contrast the usual and rational explanations that are given of this particular phenomenon with their summary exposition of it. A man is avaricious, with them, whenever the organ of acquisitiveness is largely developed in him! and this is all they can tell of the matter: And they have the modesty to hold up this notable truism as rendering quite unnecessary or ridiculous the explanations which the uninitiated had previously attempted of this common propensity—as, by referring it, in particular instances, to early habits of necessary frugality—to distaste or alarm at the spectacle or experience of great profusion—to long continued precept and example—to the union of timidity and love of power—and, in almost all cases, to the gradual strengthening of the association between the actual gratifications which wealth may procure, and the wealth itself which represents them—till the two things are actually confounded in the apprehension. That the avarice of particular persons may often be traced to such causes, we apprehend to be matter of plain fact and observation; and that such causes have always a tendency to produce that propensity, we conceive to be quite undeniable; and, without saying much in exaltation of the sense or philosophy which furnished those plain suggestions, we really must be allowed to prefer them to the flat stupidity of the assertion, that men are avaricious, because they have an unusually large bump, of a rectangular form, a little above the ear,—and that this bump is the organ of a peculiar sense or faculty by which we get a notion of the value of property!

Take, again, the pretended sense or faculty of Order, or that principle of our nature by which we delight in the symmetrical arrangement and nice distribution of things around us—Might it not suffice to account for such a phenomenon, that such orderly arrangements were found to be extremely convenient, in one set of cases—and that they suggested agreeable impressions of human power and ingenuity, in another? If a man keep his books, papers, and clothes, in a state of confusion, he will in-

fallibly have a great deal of trouble whenever he wishes to make use of them; and if he does not like trouble, he *must* come to regard that good order by which alone he can be saved from it, with some degree of pleasure and approbation. To suppose, therefore, that he must have a peculiar, independent faculty, to give him a sense of the value of order, is about as rational, as to say, that a man who had been cured of colic by laudanum, could not have a proper esteem for the virtues of that drug, unless, in addition to his memory and common sense, he had been endowed with a separate, original faculty, to be entitled Laudanum—or perchance Philanodyneneſs!

As to the degree in which different individuals are found to possess this love of order, we willingly leave it to our readers to determine, whether it is most rationally accounted for by the Phrenologists, who say it depends entirely on the relative size of a small protuberance near the outer angle of the eyebrow, or by the less gifted observers who refer it to the habits in which the said individuals have been trained; the irritability or easiness of temper which make small annoyances of more or less importance to them; and the nature of their pursuits and occupations, as more or less consistent with the recurrence of such annoyances. As to the taste for symmetry, in buildings, furniture, &c., which is quite a different thing from the love of order in things about one's person, we humbly conceive that this is sufficiently explained by its being plainly indicative of art and successful ingenuity, and being associated with the established models of taste, fitness, or magnificence. That we have no absolute or inherent relish for mere order or uniformity, is apparent, accordingly, from the obvious fact, that it ceases to be agreeable whenever it is disjoined from those suggestions of ingenuity or fitness. The uniformity that is pleasing in the two sides of a room or a building, would be monstrous in the two sides of a landscape. What we require in the pillars of a collonade, would not be endured in the trees of a grove, or even of an avenue. It is merely in works of *Art* in short, and only in such of them as ostentatiously claim this character, that methodical or symmetrical dispositions are pleasing. They would be quite the reverse in the far greater number of beautiful and sublime objects with which we are surrounded. What should we think of mountains in regular cubes, lakes in parallelograms, and clouds, forests, or constellations in correct mathematical forms, and relative positions? And yet we have a primitive and inherent faculty for admiring these things! and it is one and the same faculty which leads an orderly man of business to tie up his papers in well doc-



quetted bundles, and a notable housewife to arrange her linen in nice wardrobes and accurate inventories !

It would be easy to deal, in this way, with almost all of the primitive faculties of the Phrenologists ; and to show, not only that they may be resolved into more general and familiar principles, but that they must be multiplied an hundred fold, if the views are sound on which we are now required to admit them. We are rather inclined, however, to think that this is unnecessary ; and really cannot help feeling, that this serious and systematic way of treating their pretensions is somewhat unsuitable to their character,—and is not well calculated to give the uninstructed reader an adequate idea of the excessive crudity, shallowness, and puerility of their metaphysical theory. To do full justice to this, it is necessary to recur to their own exposition of it ; and we cannot begin more auspiciously, than by a few extracts from Mr Combe's chapter on ' Concentrativeness, '—a faculty of much note and importance in his scheme, having a goodly organ in the back part of the head, just above love of children, and below self-esteem. The oracles of Phrenology are unluckily divided as to the true nature of the faculty which acts by this posterior protuberance :—and it may help to give some idea of the certainty and maturity which this science of observation has attained, just to mention, that Dr Gall opines it to indicate pride in men, and a love of high situations in the inferior animals !—while Dr Spurzheim is confident that, in both, it merely marks what he is pleased, very luminously, to denominate ' a particular disposition with regard to their dwelling places ; '—and Mr Combe thinks it clear, that it points out only ' the power of concentrating our thoughts. ' This, to be sure, is very edifying ; but it is well worth while to see how these sages dispute the matter with each other. After observing that the existence and locality of the organs are ' well ascertained, ' Mr Combe informs us, that

' Dr GALL conceives it to be connected in animals with the *love of physical elevation*, and in man with *pride* or *Self-Esteem*. Dr SPURZHEIM observed it to be large in those animals and persons who seemed *attached to particular places*. " I consider, " says he, " in animals, the cerebral part immediately above the organ of Philoprogenitiveness, as the organ of the instinct that prompts them to select a *peculiar dwelling*, and call it the organ of *Inhabitiveness*. My attention has been, and is, still directed to such individuals of the human kind as *shew a particular disposition in regard to their dwelling place*. Some nations are extremely *attached* to their country, while others are readily induced to migrate. Some tribes wander about without fixed habitations, while others have a settled home. Mountaineers are commonly much *attached to their native soil*, and those of them who visit capitals or foreign countries,

seem chiefly led by the hope of gaining money enough to return home, and buy a little property, even though the land should be dearer there than elsewhere! I therefore invite the phrenologists, who have an opportunity of visiting various nations, particularly fond of their country, to examine the development of the organ marked No. III., and situated immediately above Philoprogenitiveness. In all civilized nations, *some individuals* have a great predilection for residing in the country. If professional pursuits oblige them to *live in town*, their endeavour is to collect a fortune as speedily as possible, that they may indulge their *leading propensity*. I have examined the heads of several individuals of this description, and found the parts in question much developed."—*Phrenology*, p. 126. The function, however, is stated by him as only conjectural. From a *number of observations*, the faculty appears to me to have a *more extensive sphere of action*, than that assigned to it by Dr SPURZHEIM.

‘I have noticed that some persons possess a natural facility of *concentrating their feelings and thoughts*, without the tendency to be distracted by the intrusion of emotions or ideas foreign to the main point under consideration. Such persons possess a command over their feelings and intellectual powers, so as to be able to direct them in their whole vigour to the pursuit which forms the object of their study for the time; and hence they produce *the greatest possible results* from the particular endowment which nature has bestowed on them. Other individuals, on the other hand, have been observed, whose feelings do not act in combination, who find their thoughts lost in dissipation, who are unable to keep the leading idea in its situation of becoming prominence, are distracted by accessaries; and, in short, experience great difficulty in combining their whole powers to a single object. The organ was perceived to be large in the former, and small in the latter.’ pp. 77–78.

As a farther proof of the minuteness and accuracy of his observations, the learned author is afterwards pleased to tell us that ‘he has remarked, that individuals in whom the organ is ‘small, although acute and steady in their general habits, *have great difficulty in transcribing or engrossing papers correctly*,’—and then proceeds with much *naïveté* to record, that

‘The first idea that led me to the conclusion, that it is the tendency to concentrate the mind within itself, and to direct its powers in a combined effort to one object, was suggested by a lady, who had remarked this quality in individuals in whom the organ was large. The Reverend DAVID WELSH and Dr HOPPE of Copenhagen, having been informed of these views, unknown to each other, communicated to me the inference, that the faculty gives a *tendency to dwell in a place*, or on *feelings and ideas* for a length of time! till all, or the majority, of the other faculties, are *satisfied* in regard to them. Dr SPURZHEIM, however, objects to these ideas; and states, that *his experience is in contradiction to them*. Facts alone must determine between us.’ pp. 79–81.

The most profound and original part of the speculation, how-

ever, certainly consists in the following objection of Dr Spurzheim, and our author's answer.

' Dr SPURZHEIM objects farther, that "*no one, in concentrating his mind, and directing his powers to one object, exhibits gestures and motions indicating activity in the back part of the head!* the whole of the natural language shows, that *concentration takes place in the forehead.*" With the greatest deference to Dr SPURZHEIM's superior skill and accuracy, I take the liberty of stating, that, so far as my own observation goes, those persons who really possess the power of concentration, while preparing to make a powerful and combined exertion of all their powers, *naturally draw the head and body backwards in the line of this organ!* Preachers and advocates in whom it is large, while speaking with animation, *move the head in the line of Concentrativeness and Individuality!* or straight backwards and forwards,—as if Concentrativeness supplied the impetus, and the organs in the forehead served as the instruments to give it form and utterance.' pp. 83.

These passages, we really think, decisive as to the merits of the system which they are meant to illustrate. That three men, all of more than common acuteness, should thus write nonsense, as it were in competition with each other, can only be explained, we think, by the extreme and incurable absurdity of the theory they had undertaken to support. That theory made it necessary for them to find out some primitive faculty of the mind, to give employment to a large bump on the skull, which it obliged them to consider as an organ of the intellect; and, to such extremities are they reduced in devising such a faculty, that one of them actually gives that denomination to a supposed *propensity to inhabit high places*, which he poetically identifies with *pride*; another to some undefined, and undefinable, *peculiarity of disposition with regard to dwelling places*—which, it seems, may take the shape either of a love for one's native country, or a taste for rural situations—or, for any thing we can see, a preference of brick houses to buildings of stone; and the third to the power, generally, of *concentrating our thoughts on any given subject*—which is much the same thing as if any one were to tell us that, besides the faculty of seeing, he had ascertained that we had another, which enabled us to look *fixedly* on the things before us—and that this faculty had an organ of its own, quite away from the eye, and somewhere below the ear.

We shall say nothing of the reasonings and observations on which this notable discovery is said to be founded—except merely to recall to our reader's recollection that admirable test to which both Dr Spurzheim and our author concur in referring—though they unfortunately differ in an extraordinary way as to the result of its application. When a

faculty is in a state of activity, they seem both to take it for granted, that the individual must 'make motions and gestures,' *in the line or direction of its external organ*; and while Dr S. objects that men who are merely concentrating their thoughts, do not indicate any activity in the *back part of the head*, where the organ of this faculty is situated, Mr Combe, admitting both the fact and the principle, ingeniously evades the conclusion, by suggesting that the operation of this faculty is generally conjoined—though heaven knows how or why—with that of Individuality—which has its seat in the anterior part of the skull; and that the two together consequently draw the unhappy patient alternately in *both* directions—which is his most recondite solution of the fact, that preachers and other orators are apt, when speaking with animation, to move their heads both backwards and forwards alternately!—which we should humbly conceive they must necessarily do, if they move them *oftener than once* in either of the opposed directions. The great practical truth however is, that when any faculty is in a state of activity, the head at least, if not the whole body, is moved in the direction of the external organ of that faculty. The test, it is obvious, cannot be well applied to the organs which happen to be placed in the anterior parts of the head; because, as we naturally see and speak, and walk and bend, in that direction, it would plainly be impossible to distinguish what part of our forward movements were to be ascribed to these causes, and what to the mere activity of the intellectual organs. With regard, again, to those that are placed laterally, as they are always in pairs, one on each side, it might perhaps be expected that, when in full activity, they should produce a regular swing or oscillation of the head, in that direction; but as it is possible that they may, in this respect, exactly balance and neutralize each other, we shall not insist much on the want of the side shake which should accompany their many operations,—but admit that the *experimentum crucis* can only be made as to those which have their seat in the *back* part of the head, and which, very fortunately, are of too prominent and important a description to have any thing doubtful or obscure in their manifestations. In that quarter are situated, 1. Love of Children; 2. Love of Women; 3. Love of Fame; 4. Pride; 5. Constancy of Affection; and, 6. Caution or Cowardice. Now, has it ever been observed that, when any of these sentiments are excited, the head is moved *backwards*, and the organs propelled towards their appropriate objects? When a man fondles his children, does he project towards them the nape of his neck? When he gazes amorously on a beautiful girl, does he forthwith turn

his back on her, and present the upper part of his spine? When he seeks the applause of assembled multitudes, in the senate, on the battle-field, on the stage, is he irresistibly moved to go to the left about, and advance the posterior curves of his cranium? Has a proud man a natural tendency to move backwards? Are constant friends and lovers generally to be found drifting down, stern foremost, on the objects of their affections? In the case of Cowardice, indeed, we must admit that turning the back is natural: But we cannot but think that it is better accounted for by the aversion the party has, in such cases, to face danger, and the facility which that judicious movement gives him to run away from it, than by the accidental position of the organ of Cautiousness on the hinder disk of the skull.

The chapter of 'Individuality' is scarcely less characteristic. This also is a very important faculty with the phrenologists; and has its organ—or its two organs—in the very middle of the brow, immediately above the root of the nose. They are large organs—and have, beyond all doubt, a great effect on the character; but *how* they affect it, or what they denote, the great Doctors of the school, it seems, are not yet agreed—and few of their pupils, we suppose, will pretend to understand. Dr Gall, the great founder of the sect, at first mistook this central protuberance for the organ of the 'Memory of Things;' but afterwards came to be satisfied that it was truly the organ of a very simple and conceivable faculty, which he has ingeniously denominated 'The Sense of Things—or the capacity of being *Educated*—or of *perfectibility*!' Dr Spurzheim, again, has ascertained that there are *two* organs, and consequently two distinct faculties—one placed exactly above the other;—that the undermost, which is properly called Individuality, 'recognises the existence of individual beings'—and that the uppermost, which it seems must be called Eventuality, gives us the capacity of 'attending to phenomena, facts, events, natural history, and anecdotes.' Mr Combe concurs with Dr Spurzheim in thinking, that there are clearly two faculties; but being more stingy in his onomatopoeia, he will only afford one name for both—and calls the one 'upper, and the other lower Individuality'—the upper being that which gives 'a fondness for natural history, and for remembering facts recorded in books, or narrated by men,' while the lower only predisposes us to 'observe what occurs around us, and to take an *interest* in Events!'—And, finally, the Reverend Mr Welsh, who is a great authority, we find, among the initiated, is decidedly of opinion that one of the Individualities is

merely the organ of our perception of *Motion*, and the other of something else—we really forget what.

It cannot be necessary, we suppose, to point out how admirably these definitions agree with all preexisting ideas of the nature of a simple and independent faculty—or with each other. But it may be necessary to satisfy our readers, that they really have been advisedly put forth by men pretending to have effected a prodigious reformation in philosophy; and, indeed, without perusing the very words of their authors, we are quite sensible that no just conception of their folly and extravagance could be obtained. Of Dr Gall, then, it is here recorded, that

At first he regarded this as the organ of the “memory of things;” but, on further reflection, he perceived, that the name “memory of things” does not include the whole sphere of activity of the organ now under consideration. He observed, that persons who had this part of the brain large, possessed not only a *great memory for facts*, but were distinguished by a *prompt conception in general*, and an extreme facility of apprehension; a *strong desire for information*, and instruction; a *disposition to study all branches of knowledge*, and to *teach these* to others; and also, that, if not restrained by the higher faculties, such persons were naturally *prone to adopt the opinions of others*, to embrace *new doctrines*, and to modify their own minds according to the manners, customs, and circumstances with which they were surrounded. He therefore rejected the name, “memory of things,” and he now uses the appellations “*Sens des choses*, *sens d’éducabilité, de perfectibilité*,” to distinguish this faculty.’ p. 275.

Here this simple and original faculty is distinctly stated to consist of at least *seven* separate, and not very congruous, faculties—some of which have been long familiar to all observers—and of every one of which it is much easier to conceive as an independent faculty, than of the far greater part of the 36 which have been admitted to that honour by the phrenologists. There is, 1st, great Memory for facts; 2. prompt Conception in general—that is, of course, of reasonings as well as facts; 3. strong Desire for information; 4. Disposition to study all branches of knowledge—speculative therefore as well as empirical; 5. Disposition to *teach* all these to others; 6. Proneness to adopt the opinions of others; 7. Inclination to *new doctrines* of all sorts.—And we are seriously required to believe, that all these diversified powers, faculties and dispositions, constitute but one distinct, universal sense or function of the human mind,—primitive, essential, independent, and acting by an established material organ, like the function of seeing or hearing! Absurd as this is, however, we rather think it is overmatched by the absurdity of Dr Spurzheim, who is here reported to have delivered his oracle as follows:—

‘ Moreover, continues Dr SPURZHEIM, it seems to me that this faculty recognises the activity of every other, whether external or internal, and acts in its turn upon all of them ! It desires to know every thing by experience, and consequently excites all the other organs to activity ; it would hear, see, smell, taste, and touch ; is fond of general instruction, and inclines to the pursuit of practical knowledge. It is essential to editors, secretaries, historians, and teachers. By knowing the functions of the other powers, this faculty contributes essentially to the unity of Consciousness. It seems to perceive the impressions, which are the immediate functions of the external senses, and to change these into notions or ideas ! Moreover, it appears to be essential to attention in general, and to the recognition of the entity myself, in philosophy.’ p. 281.

We really cannot presume to comment upon any thing so transcendental as this. Mr Combe, of course, is not so rash or mystical as his two great originals ; but in substance adopts the extravagances of both. He holds, as we have already seen, that the upper individuality makes men ‘ fond of natural history,’—and also constitutes ‘ a good memory for facts (of course of all kinds) recorded in books or narrated by men ’—while the under makes them ‘ observant of events, and interested in what takes place around them,’—and both together, as we learn in another place, to our no small surprise, ‘ give the tendency to personification, or to invest abstract or inanimate objects with personality ;’—and finally, we are told,

‘ These organs confer on the merchant, banker, and practical man-of-business, that talent for detail and readiness of observation, which are essential to the advantageous management of affairs. To a shopman or warehouseman they are highly useful ; and contribute to that ready smartness which is necessary in retail trade.—Persons who excel at whist, generally possess the lower Individuality large ; and if both of the organs be deficient, eminence will not easily be attained in this game !’ p. 278.

Mr Combe says somewhere, that a single well-attested instance of a large bump without the corresponding faculty, or of a remarkable development of a faculty without the corresponding bump, would be conclusive against his whole theory. But have we not this refutation of it, in the passages to which we have just referred ? Four learned Phrenologists, each of course proceeding upon careful and repeated observation, give four separate and irreconcilable accounts of the nature of the faculty indicated by a protuberance above the nose—that is, they each testify that, according to his experience, it is *not* accompanied by the faculty with which the others say it is accompanied ! Dr Gall says he has found it accompanied only by a capacity of being educated, or of becoming perfect. Dr Spurzheim says it denotes merely the power of distinguishing individuals, or attending to Natural History. Mr Combe has

found it conjoined with a turn for personification; and Mr Welsh, after long observation, has ascertained that, according to *his* experience, it is merely the organ by which we get the idea of Motion! The result of the whole we think is, undeniably, that, by the observation of four persons of the most undisputed competency, it is proved *not* to be uniformly or generally indicative of any one quality or propensity whatever—but to be occasionally found in persons of all different characters—as we have no doubt indeed that all the other bumps may be! And all these contradictory and self-refuting statements are composedly placed, side by side, in a volume intended to afford a rigorous demonstration of the Science, on the principles now referred to, and in the style of which we have given some feeble specimens!

Such are the philosophers who talk with contempt and compassion of the shallow distinctions and puerile speculations of Locke, Hume, Berkley, Hartley, Reid, and Stewart,—who modestly tell us, that up to their time, ‘the philosophy of man was a perfect waste, with not one inch of ground in it cultivated or improved,’—and, distinctly stating the discoveries of Newton himself to have been comparatively insignificant, very composedly announce their own as by far ‘the greatest and most important EVER communicated to mankind!’

‘The discoveries,’ says Mr COMBE, ‘of the revolution of the globe, and the circulation of the blood, were splendid displays of genius in their authors, and interesting and beneficial to mankind; but their results, compared with the consequences which must inevitably follow from Dr GALL’s discovery of the functions of the brain, (embracing, as it does, the true theory of the animal, moral, and intellectual constitution of man), sink into relative insignificance. Looking forward to the time when the real nature and ultimate effects of Dr GALL’s discovery shall be fully recognised, I cannot entertain a doubt that *posterity* will manifest as eager a desire to render *homage* and *honour* to his memory,’ &c. &c. p. 548.

We had really imagined that this style had been for some time abandoned to Messrs Cobbett and Owen—and to the venders of blacking, kalydor, and panaceas.

We have been sorely tempted to say a few words on the choice phrenological faculties of Conscientiousness and Ideality, but our limits will no longer admit of it; and, though we are always glad to have an apology for speculating a little on the interesting and difficult subjects of Taste and Morals, we must confess that the doctrines of the Phrenologists supply but scanty materials for such speculation—their whole philosophy com-



sisting of a mere *dogmatical assertion*, that our sense of right and wrong, as to all duties and virtues whatsoever, and all moral principle and sensibility, are referable to a primitive independent faculty, the vigour and delicacy of which is in exact proportion to the size of two quadrangular swellings on the upper part of the skull ! And in like manner, that all taste and genius—and in an especial manner all talent for poetry in all its branches, and all tendency to metaphorical language—and all admiration of natural scenery—together with all love of flowers, figures, and fantasies, are the symptoms and gifts of one simple, uncompounded, original faculty—which has its organ near the temples, and has had its place and functions, we are gravely assured, all ‘fully established.’

We must think however of making an end of this. We have now said enough, we suppose, to make our readers understand the nature both of the phrenological metaphysics, and of our objections to them ; and shall therefore conclude this branch of the subject with a brief notice of two or three other faculties, which seem to afford a compendious illustration of all we have been endeavouring to establish. There is, for example, a faculty of *Hope*,—a distinct, primitive faculty—as Dr Spurzheim is said to have ‘ascertained by analysis,’—and accommodated, accordingly, with two organs in the upper part of the skull. Now, can any person, with the least capacity of reflection, really suppose that Hope is a primitive independent faculty—that it is any thing else, in short, than *the apprehension of probable, but uncertain good*—or that any being, capable of apprehending good, and of calculating, in some degree, the probability of its occurrence, could be without this sentiment,—or could possibly require a separate faculty, and a separate organ to make him capable of it ? If we look through two pieces of glass, one stained red, and the other blue, we necessarily receive the impression of purple—if we mix up lemon juice with sugar, we necessarily receive the impression of a mixed or compound taste, of sweet and sour—and if we contemplate the idea of happiness, or good fortune, mixed up or combined with that of uncertainty, we necessarily receive the impression or sentiment of hope. But if it would be absurd to suppose, that any other sense than that of seeing, or any other organ than the eye, was necessary to perceive the purple colour (and it is the same as to the instance of taste), can it be less absurd to suppose any other faculty necessary to give us the sentiment of hope, than those of recollecting or conceiving pleasurable sensations—and of estimating, however loosely, the probabilities of their recurrence ? It is a distinct sentiment, no doubt,

just as the perception of purple, or of mingled sweet and sour, is, and as all compound or modified sentiments necessarily are; but to erect it, on this account, into an original and primitive faculty of our nature—and, above all, to represent it as acting through a peculiar and separate external organ, really does appear to us the very height of absurdity.

If it be once ascertained, however, that the sentiment itself is a necessary result of certain known and familiar impressions, the varieties which may occur in the degree in which it is indicated in different individuals, can plainly afford no ground for questioning the soundness of this analysis, or referring it to the operation of a separate and peculiar faculty. If the faculty of *walking* has been once proved to result from the joint action of certain nerves and muscles, the fact that some persons walk faster and better than others, can never bring this truth into doubt; or lend the least probability to the suggestion, that it may perchance depend, not upon the known nerves and muscles, which fully account for it, but on some other peculiar nerve or muscle, of which nobody knows any thing, but which may possibly exist—and by the size, or some other quality of which, it is also possible that the strength of the walking power may be determined. It is of no great consequence, therefore, whether the different tendencies to hope or to fear, by which individuals may be distinguished, can be satisfactorily explained or not. It is, with great submission, *no explanation at all*, to say that they depend on the size of one, or of the sets of bumps on the skull: For that is merely saying, that they exist—and that the bumps exist also. It is quite plain, we take it, that the preponderance of hope or of fear depends upon the estimate that is actually formed of the comparative likelihood of the occurrence of *contingent good or evil*: and that, whatever the circumstances are which determine an individual to look for one result rather than the other, they *must* be circumstances *which affect this calculation of chances*, as an intellectual operation, and cannot possibly be referred to the activity of some inconceivable organ, of a separate faculty still more inconceivable. It would not be difficult, we think, to indicate generally what those circumstances commonly are, in the intellectual and moral training of different individuals; but the speculation, we conceive, is quite foreign to the present argument, and we cannot now afford to enter on it.

But there is another notable doctrine in this short chapter of Hope, which recurs also in several other parts of the phrenological hypothesis. Not only is Hope a faculty by itself, but *it has an antagonist faculty*, with a separate organ of course, called

Cautiousness, which gives tendencies precisely opposite to those given by Hope;—the one leading us to expect good, in a state of uncertainty—the other to expect evil. ‘Hence,’ says Mr Combe, with much *naïveté*, ‘he who has Hope more powerful than Cautiousness, lives in the enjoyment of brilliant anticipations—while he who has Cautiousness more powerful than Hope, lives under the painful apprehension of evils which rarely exist.’ And again, ‘when this organ is very deficient, and that of Cautiousness large, a gloomy despondency is apt to invade the mind;’ and a similar doctrine is elsewhere delivered as to Benevolence and its opposites, and we believe some other faculties. Now, this really seems to us a very wasteful way of providing the mind with its faculties,—and not a very philosophical, nor, even on phrenological principles, a very consistent way. If Hope and Cautiousness are exactly opposed to each other, why should there be *two* faculties? It would seem easier certainly, to bring down Hope to the requisite standard, simply by diminishing its peculiar organ, than by leaving it large, and adding to the bulk of Cautiousness. But the truth is, that the two principles are substantially one and the same, and necessarily imply each other—as much as heat and cold do. The increment of the one is necessarily the decrement of the other. If, in the contemplation of danger, a man fears much, he, by necessary consequence, hopes little—if he hopes much, he fears little. It is no matter which form of expression is used, since they both obviously mean the same thing; and indicate exactly the same state of mind or feeling. They are the two buckets in the well:—and it is not less absurd to ascribe them to different principles, than it would be to maintain, that the descent of the one bucket depends on causes quite separate from that which occasion the ascent of the other:—and the superfluity of the Phrenologists in these instances, is but faintly typified by that of the wisacre who made *two* holes in his barn-door; one—to let his cat *in* to kill the mice, and the other—to let her *out*! They might as well maintain, that besides the eye to give us intimations of light, we must have another sense and another organ, to give us the impression of darkness.

But even if we could swallow all this, the concession, we think, would only involve the theory in more glaring contradictions. All the phrenological faculties are necessarily distinct and independent. It is a part of their definition that they may all act, or cease from acting, singly. They act accordingly by separate organs, and in no instance control or interfere with the operations of each other. A man with a large organ

of Hope, therefore, *must*, we should think, at all events, and in all cases, hope resolutely—whatever was the state of his organ of Cautiousness, or of any other faculty. How he could also, and at the same time, fear vehemently, we must leave the Phrenologists to explain: But that he must do both, just as absolutely as if he did but one, seems to be a necessary consequence of the fundamental principles of the science. It is plainly impossible, upon these principles, that the operations of the two faculties should modify or mutually check each other. They are separate and independent powers,—acting through separate and independent organs; and to suppose that the one affected the other, would not be less inconsistent than to suppose, that the movements of one watch, shut up in its own case, and in the pocket of its owner, should affect the movements of another, in his neighbour's pocket—so that if the one had a tendency to go too fast, this might be corrected by the other having a tendency to go too slow! If it be said that the two faculties *must* affect each other, in such cases as those of hope and fear, because they act upon the same mind and under the same circumstances, in opposite directions—we answer, that the conclusion is no doubt unavoidable; but that it is not the less contradictory to the phrenological theory—and that the result therefore is, that the theory must be false, and that there can be but one faculty in operation, and not two,—if indeed we had not already shown that it is utterly absurd, in this particular instance, to suppose that there is any separate or original faculty at all.

It is scarcely worth while perhaps, to add, that this theory of antagonist principles is not followed out in the system, in the way in which consistency would require, if there were any ground for assuming it in those particular instances. If we are to account for the diminution of Hope by a positive increment of Fear, why should we not explain the weakness of maternal Affection in some cases, by the large development of an organ of maternal Hatred? the lowness of self-Esteem by the magnitude of self-Contempt? or the indifference to Fame by the extraordinary operation of the love of Infamy and disgrace? All the propensities at least should be accommodated with a counterpoise of this kind; or rather, this balancing system ought to be extended into all the departments of intellect. Destructiveness already forms a very pretty *pendant* to Constructiveness. But there should plainly be a principle of Prodigality to match that of Hoarding—a faculty of Scoffing to set off against Veneration—and a talent for Silence to compensate that of Language. Without these additions, the system is plainly not only incom-

plete, but incoherent; and we have no doubt that all true phrenologists will be thankful to us for their suggestion.

But there is an organ, and, of course, a faculty, of *Form*, it seems,—and an organ of *Colour*—and one of *Size*, and a separate and independent one, even of *Weight*! The old notion was, that the functions of all these new faculties were performed by those of *Sight* and of *Touch*. But this, we learn, has been found to be mere childishness—and that, upon principles which go a little farther perhaps than the Phrenologists themselves are aware of. But first let us hear the oracle.

‘The nerves of touch, and the organ of sight, *do not form ideas of any kind*; so that the power of conceiving size cannot be in proportion to the endowment of them. Dr SPURZHEIM, therefore, inferred by reasoning, that there would be a faculty, *the function of which is to perceive size*; and observation has proved the soundness of this conclusion;’—and the same thing nearly is said of the other faculties we have mentioned.

Now, assuming all this to be true, and that we really do not perceive form, size, colour or weight, by our sight or touch, why, we would ask, are the new auxiliary faculties to be limited to these four? Why have we not a faculty and an organ for distinguishing Solids from Fluids—another for perceiving Hardness and Softness—and another and another for Roughness and Smoothness—Rest and Motion, Wetness and Dryness, Elasticity and the want of it, &c. &c.? All these are qualities or states of bodies quite as prominent and perceptible as their size, form, or colour—and of which it is just as necessary that we should have the means of ‘forming ideas.’ Nay, this is equally true of *every quality*, and every shade and degree of every quality, which we are capable of perceiving in them. The red of a rose, for example, is a quality in the object, and a sensation or idea in us, just as distinct from the blue of the sky, as either is from the shape of a billiard ball, or the size of a table. If it is not by the sight that we perceive colour at all, we see no reason for supposing that we can perceive more than one colour by one faculty. The different colours are in themselves totally distinct qualities, and the causes of distinct sensations and ideas in the observer. The only good reason that can be given, as we intimated in the outset, for classing them under one name or category (viz. Colour), is, that they were supposed to be all perceived by the Eye. But if this is denied, and a separate faculty and organ is insisted on for every separate and distinct perception or idea, we really see no reason for not having an organ not only for every shade of colour, but for every diversity of quality by which external objects are distinguished—for the

smoothness of oil as distinguished from the smoothness of water—the softness of silk as different from the softness of wool—or the roughness of a second day's beard from the roughness of a rough-cast wall. Our *thoughtful* readers will see at once how deep this goes into the whole theory. But, at all events, we defy any mortal man to show how, if our sight and touch cannot give us ideas of form, size or colour, without the help of other separate faculties and organs, we should have any perception or idea of softness and hardness, motion and rest, and the other qualities we have enumerated, without additional special faculties and organs for the purpose—of all which, however, the Phrenologists have left us shamefully unprovided. It will not do to suggest here, or in other cases where the allowance of faculties is plainly insufficient, that these are mere omissions, which may still be supplied, if necessary, and do not affect the principle of the system. The system, it must be remembered, rests, *not on principle, but on Observation alone*. Its advocates peril their cause on the assertion that it is *proved* by observation, and as matter of fact, that their thirty-six bumps are the organs of thirty-six particular faculties, and no other—that these organs have a certain definite shape, and relative place and size—and that among them they cover the whole skull, and occupy the whole surface of the brain. If they are wrong in any of these assertions, there is an end of the whole system; for they are wrong in the facts and observations on which *alone* it professes to rest. They must stand or fall, therefore, on the ground they have chosen. There is no room for them to extend their position, or even to vary it in any considerable degree; and they are as effectually ruined by the suggestion of faculties which they have omitted, as by disproving the existence or possibility of those which they have assumed.

But is it indeed true, as Mr Combe so confidently alleges, that we cannot perceive colour, form or size, by the eye, or form, size and weight, by the touch? and that we really perceive all those qualities only by means of certain little bumps or knobs scattered along the line of the eyebrows?

Let us begin with Colour. So far is it from being true, that we do not perceive colour by the eye (though Mr C. distinctly tells us that 'there are persons who have the sense of vision 'acute, and yet are almost destitute of the power of perceiving 'colours'), that in reality it is colour, *and colour alone*, that is the primary object of its perceptions. What we see indeed is only light: but light is always coloured (if we include white as a colour), and the different colours are in reality but *so many kinds of light*. If we never saw any thing but green, for example,

our idea of light and of green would be *identical*. If we were fixed, from our birth, in such a position as to have no other object of vision but the blue vault of heaven, our perceptions of light and of blue would be one and the same. Colour, in short, is the only quality of light by which we are ever made aware of its existence; and to say that we do not see colour by the eye, is in reality to say that *we do not see* at all: for the strict and ultimate fact is, that we never see any thing else.\* As to the trash which Mr Combe has condescended to insert about the necessity of our having a peculiar sense and organ of colouring, to enable us 'to conceive the relations of different colours to each other, or to enjoy their harmony or discord,' we really have nothing to answer—except that some of these notions are evidently the results of study and observation, and not objects of perception at all—and that the rest seem to fall directly within the province of Ideality, as described by himself.

As to Form, again, there is the same confusion of the simple power of distinguishing the figures of objects, and that of receiving pleasure from the contemplation of their proportions or relations, as we have just noticed in the instance of Colour. It is the last only which we contend belongs to the old and familiar faculties of sight and touch. The latter must be referred to the chapter of taste and beauty; and it may be observed, is already provided for, on the lavish system of the Phrenologists, by no less than two other faculties and organs,

---

\* It is worth while perhaps to observe, that in treating of this faculty, Mr Combe is pleased (at page 301) to notice the case of an individual, with whose speculations on the beauty of colours he does not agree, and whose errors upon the subject he triumphantly accounts for, by recording it as 'a curious fact, that in his head the Organ of Colouring is *absolutely depressed*!' A more complete case of destitution of the faculty could not of course be imagined; and accordingly, the learned author proceeds most reasonably to infer, that he must be in the condition of those unfortunate persons 'who cannot distinguish dark 'brown from scarlet, or buff from orange.' Now, without meaning to call in question the fact of the depression in his skull, we happen to *know* that the individual here mentioned has a remarkably fine and exact perception of colours—so as to be able to match them from memory, with a precision which has been the admiration of many ladies and dressmakers. He has also an uncommon sensibility to their beauty;—and spends more time than most people in gazing on bright flowers and peacocks' necks—and wondering, he hopes innocently, what can be the cause of his enjoyment. Even the Phrenologists we think must admit, that, *in his case*, it cannot be the predominance of the appropriate faculty—since they have ascertained that he is totally destitute of the organ. But this belongs properly to the chapter of Evidence.

—that of Ideality namely, and that of Order. But as to the mere power of distinguishing forms, is it possible, we would ask, to separate this from the powers of sight and touch? or to conceive that these should exist in us, as they now do, without the perception of form? Take the case of sight first. It is true, as we have already observed, that we see nothing but colour: and accordingly, if all objects were of the same colour, both as to shade and intensity, we certainly should never perceive their forms by the eye. But where their colours differ, it is, for the very same reason, impossible that we should *not* see their *forms*. If we see different colours—we must see the lines by which they are respectively bounded; and these of course are the outlines of their forms. If, on a dark blue wall, there be painted a circle of bright yellow, is it possible to conceive that any being, with the faculty of sight only, should look on it without seeing the difference of the colours, and, by necessary consequence, the form of the line by which they are bounded, or, in other words, the shape of that which is included? and if, by the side of the circle, there be farther drawn a triangle and a square, can it be doubted that he will perceive the difference of these forms from each other? We maintain, that these perceptions are included in the narrowest conception of the faculty of seeing—and that it amounts to an absolute contradiction to say, that a man may see perfectly well, and yet have no idea of the figure of the objects he beholds. The power of *remembering* the forms thus beheld, or of *recalling* them when absent, is altogether a different matter; but, as the Phrenologists have now given up all their faculties of memory, we need not give ourselves any farther trouble with regard to it.

The perception of form by Touch, again, sometimes requires the aid of recollection, and is sometimes independent of it. Where the parts are complicated and minute, or the object large, so as to require a succession of touches before the whole can be gone over, some degree of memory is of course implied. But where the form is simple, and admits of being grasped or felt at once, the perception of form is as immediate as in the case of sight; and is obviously inseparable from the sensation of touch by which it is suggested. If a man grasp a billiard ball in his hand, it is plainly impossible that he should have any feeling of an included solid at all, without feeling also that it was smooth, *spherical*, and hard; and if, in his other hand, he grasped a flat ruler, he could not possibly have the sense of touch, if he was not at once aware both of the difference of the two forms, and of the general character of each. To suppose that, in addition to this sense and that of sight, we



must have another, with a separate organ, to perceive form, is really not less extravagant than to suppose that, though we have already one sense by which we perceive *squares*, we must have another separate one, to enable us to perceive *circles*.

If we do not perceive colour by the sight, nor form by the sight and touch, what is it, we should like to know, that we *do* perceive by the help of these senses, or what functions are left them to perform? If we have two separate senses, each accommodated with its appropriate material organ expressly for giving these perceptions, what use have we for the sense of seeing, or the eye? The ambition of the phrenological adventurers, it must be confessed, is sufficiently comprehensive. They not only discover new faculties and organs—but they supersede and disable all that were known before. It is as if they were to maintain, that the light in a sunny parlour exsuded through certain little holes in the carpet and the wall, and that the windows, and the sun which shone through them, had nothing at all to do with it. The deep observation that ‘the external senses cannot form ideas,’ is rather beyond our capacity. We really do not know what is meant here by *ideas*. Is it meant to be said that, by these senses, we have no *perceptions*? If this was meant, it should have been plainly stated—and we would then ask again, if they do not furnish us with perceptions, what is it that they do furnish us with? It was never supposed, we believe, that they furnished any thing else. That we are enabled to *recall* these perceptions, is a fact no doubt—and this was commonly thought to be effected by a power or faculty called Memory; but, as the operation was purely mental, it did not occur to any one that it must be provided with a special material organ, or three or four organs, on the surface of the skull—which was the first discovery of the Phrenologists; and still less that it was a part of the business of the separate and newly imagined faculties, apart from sight and touch, by which we perceived colour, form, and other material qualities.

All that we have now said applies equally well to the supposed faculty of perceiving Size. No man who can clearly see a small wafer lying in a china plate, on a circular grass plot, can fail to perceive a difference in the sizes of these three circles. No man can embrace a goodly column, and then take up a slender wand, and not know, by his touch, the same difference. It is needless to dwell upon this. But the lucubrations of the Phrenologists on this original faculty are more than usually edifying. ‘A lady,’ says Mr Combe, ‘with whom I am acquainted, has Form large, and Size deficient; and in

‘drawing, she copies the *form* of an animal or the human figure easily and precisely, but is always at fault in the *Size*. She felt this as a natural defect, and complained of it before she heard of ‘phrenology.’ Now the mystery of this is admirable. Here is a lady who in drawing is always at fault as to size, and yet can make the figure of a man or animal perfectly! that is, she makes no fault at all in the *relative size* of the feet, hands, head, tail, ears, or horns of any one figure—but cannot observe proportion or uniformity in the *total size* of different figures! There *may* be such a case; for we make no question either of Mr Combe’s veracity, or that of the fair artist. But the defect plainly is not that of the organ of size—for, upon the statement, she judges perfectly of sizes, in by far the nicest and most difficult of their combinations. We would suggest as a very humble and vulgar solution of the specialty, that she has probably been more accustomed to draw *single* figures, than to group or combine them, and that a little practice in the latter branch of the art may go far to remove this supposed defect in her natural endowments. If Mr Combe disdains this suggestion, we think he has nothing for it but to make *two* organs and faculties of size,—one to take cognizance of the size of the different *parts* or members of a single body—and the other of the sizes of such bodies viewed complexly.

Last of all comes Weight: A more unlucky subject for an original faculty could not well, we think, have been selected; nor can any thing well be wilder than the work the Phrenologists have made of it. The perception of weight, we take it, is the perception of the tendency of all bodies to move, with more or less force, towards the centre of the earth; and it involves in it, as we think, the perception of three different phenomena: 1. The perception of downward *motion*, when heavy bodies are actually in a course of descent; 2. The perception of *pressure*, when the heavy body rests on the percipient; and, 3. The perception of *resistance*, when we raise or try to raise it. Now, it is very plainly by reasoning and observation, and not by the perception of any peculiar sense or faculty, that we refer all these phenomena to the operation of one cause—while the phenomena themselves are confessedly perceived by the senses of sight and touch, or the general sensibility of the body. That they do not of themselves suggest the idea of weight or gravitation, but that this is the result of experience and observation merely, and is in fact the discovery of a very important general law of matter, we conceive to be obvious upon a very slight consideration. First of all, it would be rather strange if there was a faculty by which we directly recognised and distin-

guished *the motions* produced by gravitation, from those produced by impulse or any other cause; and the fact is, that ~~an-~~terior to observation, we certainly do not so distinguish them. The motions themselves are in all cases perceived by sight or touch. Then, again, as to *pressure*, is it meant to be said that we have a special faculty by which we can certainly tell whether a pressure on our finger, or our whole body, is produced by the *mere weight* of the incumbent substance, or by the force of a screw, or by muscular exertion applied to it? If our sensations are indistinguishable in all these cases, there can be no sense of *weight*—but only of pain or pressure, for which Mr Combe has not thought it necessary to provide any new faculty—and which is manifestly quite different from the perception of motion. Finally, as to *resistance*, if we vainly endeavour to pull up a plank from the ground, is there really any faculty which will at once inform us whether the resistance is owing to its great *weight*—or to our happening ourselves to stand upon it, and, consequently, to the equal balance of the action and reaction? If there be, as there confessedly is, no such faculty, then it is quite plain that we do not get the notion of weight by the direct intimation of any separate sense, but by reasoning and inference from repeated observation of the common phenomena of motion, pressure, and resistance, under certain circumstances;—and of these diverse phenomena, it seems utterly extravagant to say, either that we are only percipient by this new faculty of Weight, or that we are not percipient of them exactly as in cases where they occur from other causes than gravitation, by our old vulgar endowments of seeing and touch.

But there are other and higher functions, it seems, to which this sense of weight is destined by the Phrenologists. It enables men to play at quoits, and to be expert at archery—but, above all, it confers eminence in mechanical science, and leads to useful discoveries in engineering!—besides giving a man a prompt knowledge of his own centre of gravity! This, we confess, is rather too puerile. There is no human occupation, sportive or serious—from ascending in balloons to working in stone quarries—in which we are permitted for a moment to forget the power of gravitation; and we really think that, in all, it is intensely and *equally* remembered. But what has this to do with mechanical Philosophy or contrivances? Every man is *equally* aware that bodies have weight—and, in machinery, and mechanical philosophy, it is indisputably not by any *tact*, or the vague intimations of any sense or faculty, but by *calculation* according to fixed principles, that they proceed either to employ or to overcome it. One man may have a bet-

ter guess than another of the probable weight of a body that is to be moved: But did any body ever hear, or even imagine, that he would proceed to make a machine to move it, in any reliance on the accuracy of this estimation? or still less, that he would, in consequence of this, be more likely than another to devise a *good machine* for the purpose? We are told indeed that Newton had the organ of this faculty very large—and that Professor Farish and Mr Whewell of Cambridge, ‘who have both ‘given great proofs of mechanical skill,’ have it also large;—and again, that it is large in a weaver of Saltcoats, who has spent much time in regulating the working of pumps—and, finally, that several persons have been met with, in whom it was *small*—and ‘who at once acknowledged *deficiency in mechanical talent*, and awkwardness in their actions and movements!’ It cannot be necessary, we should think, to make any observation on matter like this. It is not even alleged, it will be observed, that any of the great mechanical philosophers here mentioned, had, in point of fact, any different or more exact perceptions of *weight*, or of the ordinary phenomena from which the notion is derived, than the awkward individuals who acknowledged their deficiency in these branches of science. All that is alleged is, that the former had a small protuberance above the middle of the eyebrow, which was not observed in the latter. If it was necessary to make this out to be the organ of a particular faculty, we think it would have been a more likely guess to have construed it into the organ of Algebra, or of the Fluxionary faculty, than the organ of Weight. But we are tired of this—and leave the rest of the speculation about reeling drunkards and Dr Hunter’s fits of giddiness, together indeed with the whole remaining assortment of phrenological faculties, including Wit, Wonder and Causality, among many others, to the unassisted judgment of such readers as wish for farther acquaintance with them.

We have dwelt too long, we fear, on this branch of the inquiry: But, though in one sense it may be regarded as preliminary only, we confess it has always appeared to us substantially to exhaust the whole question, and to render it unnecessary to go farther. The question being, whether it be really true, that certain bumps on the head are the Organs of certain primitive, distinct and universal Faculties,—we cannot but think that it is pretty well settled, if it be made out, 1st, that there is not the least reason to suppose that any of our faculties, but those which connect us with external objects, or direct the movements of our bodies, act by material organs at all, and that the Phrenological organs have no analogy whatever with

those of the external senses ; 2d, that it is quite plain that there neither are, nor can be, any such primitive and original Faculties as the greater part of those to which such organs are assigned by the Phrenologists ; and, 3d, that if the 36, with the organs of which they have covered the whole skull, are admitted to exist, it seems impossible to refuse a similar existence to many hundreds or thousands of the same kind, for the organs and operations of which they have however left no room.

If these things be, as we humbly conceive them to be, it is plain enough that the Phrenological theory *cannot possibly be true*, as it has been hitherto maintained : And yet it does not follow, *of absolute necessity*, that *the facts* on which it is said to be grounded are consequently false. If there be no such primitive faculties as they allege, the bumps they have observed *cannot* indeed be the organs of such faculties ; and there is an end, therefore, of the *theory*. Yet it may *possibly* be true, that the particular habits, accomplishments and propensities, to which they have given the name of faculties, may be found in conjunction with these bumps. If the theory be once destroyed, the mere fact of such a conjunction must be allowed indeed to be in the highest degree improbable. But as the supposition of it implies no contradiction, it may possibly be true—and we are bound therefore, even after demolishing *the theory*, to look a little at the *evidence* by which it is said to be established. It is *possible* that every man who is hanged for forgery would be found to have been born with a peculiar protuberance in the joints of his middle fingers—that every man who publishes a quarto volume, must always have had a tumour on the inside of his knees—and that every profound Greek scholar must have come into the world with a small wen on his tongue. We admit most readily, that all rational probability is against such apparently capricious coincidences—and we imagine that most people would think themselves justified in laughing at those who maintained them, and in refusing to look into their proofs. But still the *things* are possible—and if the proofs were perfectly clear, *unequivocal* and abundant, we could not but believe in their reality. Now, this we think is the true state of the case as to Phrenology. As its advocates appeal loudly to fact and observation, we are bound to look to their evidence ;—and though we certainly think it altogether as improbable that every witty man must have been born with two triangular projections in front of his temples, and every kind mother with a large oval one on the back of her head, as that every skilful cook must have had particularly long heels, or every rich banker a very short nose—we certainly cannot take upon us to say that the facts are absolutely impossible, or that,

by very full and decisive evidence, such a preestablished harmony may not be ascertained. If the matter be taken up however on this footing, or indeed on any other footing than that of a superstitious credulity, and gaping propensity to wonder, the Phrenologists must be aware that it will not bear handling.

Suppose that we were merely to allege that, so far as our observation went, their facts seemed all to be imaginary—that it was matter of notoriety that men with large heads were *not* generally of superior endowments, nor those with small, deficient in understanding—that in the circle of our acquaintance there were many kind mothers without any protuberance on the lower part of their skulls, many men of wit with no triangular prominences beyond the temples, and many eloquent and loquacious persons of both sexes, with no unusual projection of the eyes—that in fact we had never happened to meet with any one individual in whom a marked peculiarity of character or disposition was accompanied by any of their external indications, and that we daily saw remarkable enough bumps on the heads of very ordinary people—that most of those with whom we conversed had made the same observations, and concurred in the same results; and that several who had been at first rather taken with the new doctrines, had, by more careful observation, been thoroughly convinced of their fallacy—that we had ourselves known some, and heard from good authority of many, cases of flagrant and ridiculous blunders committed by Phrenologists of the greatest eminence, which they had neither the candour to acknowledge, nor the confidence to deny—that we had met with very few persons of judgment who did not treat the whole matter as a ridiculous fancy, or imposture—and that very many of its most zealous advocates were persons who seemed to have been seduced into the belief, by having had organs discovered on their heads for talents and virtues which they had never been suspected of possessing—so that impartial observers generally required no other proof of the falsehood of their doctrines, than an exhibition of the *crania* of those very individuals who were warmest in asserting their truth.

Suppose we were merely to say these things—as we might certainly say them with the most perfect conscientiousness and good faith—what would be the reply of the Phrenologists? Why, that their experience and observations were inconsistent with ours, and that the world must judge between us. To this of course we could have no objection. But our Phrenologists, we suspect, would not stop there. They would call on us to name our instances, and would cavil at them when they were named; or, because we declined submitting the

heads of respectable ladies and gentlemen to an impertinent palpation,—and their characters, temper and manners, to a still more impertinent discussion—because we did not choose to offend many worthy people by pointing them out as the owners of bumps, without the corresponding faculties—or to engage in a quarterly wrangle about the ideality of Dr Chalmers or the adhesiveness of Mrs M'Kinnon, they would complain that we made allegations which we refused to verify, and contend that nothing but a fair scrutiny was wanting to their success. We certainly shall not gratify them, therefore, by any such specification;—and we make them heartily welcome to any advantage they can derive from our declinature. All we propose, by making these general allegations, in which they know well enough that the great body of the public concur with us, is to show, in the beginning, that the proofs upon which they rely *cannot possibly* be of the clear and conclusive nature which the case so obviously requires: Since, in a matter in itself abundantly simple, and open to the observation of all mankind, so many persons of unquestioned veracity and candour have come to conclusions so directly opposed to them. If it were really true, that certain very visible and well defined bumps on the skull were the necessary organs of all our faculties and propensities,—just as our eyes are of sight, and our ears of hearing,—it is, in the first place, inconceivable that the discovery should have remained to be made in the beginning of the 19th century;—and, in the second place, still more inconceivable, that after it was made, there should be any body who could pretend to doubt of its reality. The means of verifying it, one would think, must have been such as not to leave a pretext for the slightest hesitation; and the fact that, after twenty years preaching in its favour, it is far more generally rejected than believed, might seem to afford pretty conclusive evidence against the possibility of its truth.

The fact, however, not only is so—but, from the very nature of the case, it could not well have been otherwise. Their pretended Organs, unfortunately, are not such as can ever be proved to be organs, by any decisive, or even intelligible test; and the presence or absence, the strength or weakness, of their pretended Faculties, are equally incapable of being determined by any precise observation or experiment.

It is very material to remark here, that the Phrenologists do not even pretend to have been guided to the discovery of their organs by any direct observation of their being actually used, when the faculties which they serve are exerted. The only way they find them out is, by comparing the *size* of the organ, in persons who have the faculty in un-

*usual strength*, with its size in other cases. If all men had their faculties therefore nearly in an equal degree, it could never have been known or suspected that they had any such organs at all: and, as their observations must have been made on men, whose unusual strength of endowment may have been derived from culture and education, what assurance could they possibly have that the bumps on their heads had any thing to do with it? This is obviously a most fatal weakness in their case—and amounts, of itself, to an exclusion of all good evidence. Where should we be, for example, as to any proof of the locality of our organs of sense, if our only ground for inferring their existence was a conjecture, that some particular part of the body was larger in those who had any particular sense in unusual perfection?—and what a contrast would this present to the state of our actual knowledge? Take, for instance, the Eye, the organ of sight. How prominently and conspicuously is it pointed out, by its form, structure, and distinct apparatus, as an organ of perception!—and how immediately and unerringly are its exclusive functions ascertained, either by placing the hand upon it, and finding vision instantaneously impeded, or by observing that light may be directed to all the *other* parts of the body, without being in the least perceptible! But suppose that, instead of such a conspicuous and unequivocal organ, it had been merely conjectured that our perceptions of sight were transmitted by the instrumentality of a small excrescence on the solid and continuous bone of the skull, though it had never been observed that these perceptions ceased when that excrescence was touched or covered,—upon what possible ground could it be said to be proved, that this was the organ of sight, or had any thing to do with its perception? A vague surmise might be raised on an allegation, that where this excrescence was unusually large, the sight had been frequently found more than usually clear or strong—but as to any thing like *proof* of its being the proper organ of the faculty, there would plainly be none.

If this, however, would be the case, even with so peculiar and distinct a faculty as that of Seeing, how infinitely must the difficulty increase as to those that go by that name among the Phrenologists? If there be no sight, there can be no substitute for it—and no doubt or mistake, therefore, can ever exist as to the fact. If the eyes be once closed or obstructed, there is indisputably an end of Seeing for the time; and there is no other faculty whose intimations can be mistaken for it, or supply its peculiar perceptions; while, if the eyes are open, and in a sound state, their perceptions cannot be affected by the operations of any other faculty. The phrenolo-



gical faculties, however, almost all play into each other's hands ; and can in most cases either supply each other's places, or counterfeit their functions ; while in other cases they are controlled, impeded, and rendered indistinguishable by the action of other faculties. Thus, the functions of Combativeness and Destructiveness coincide so nearly, that the extinction of one would scarcely be missed, if the other was in great vigour. Amativeness and Benevolence together, might, for a time at least, entirely supply the want of Adhesiveness. In many situations Cautiousness might do the work of Veneration, and, joined with Imitation, or love of Approbation, might make a very tolerable substitute for Conscientiousness itself,—while Individuality, according to the description, might occasionally sustain the part either of Causality, Size, or Figure.

Still farther, there is nothing, it must always be remembered, but *the size* of the organ, by which the vigour of the faculty is to be determined. But the phrenologists admit, first of all, that the vigour of the faculty may be increased by culture and education, without any increase of the organ ; 2. that it may be also increased by morbid or occasional excitement ; and, 3. that all its manifestations may be suppressed or neutralized by the operation of some other antagonist or inconsistent faculty, whose organ is more predominant. It is quite plain, we think, that these admissions render all proper *proof* impossible, exclude the application of any decisive rule or experiment, and in fact reduce this whole ' science of observation,' to a series of mere evasions and gratuitous suppositions.

We produce, for example, a person whose whole conduct indicates great Benevolence, but who happens to have a very small bump in the place where the organ of that propensity is said to be situated. Is not this a proof of the fallacy of the system ? Oh no—by no means. The individual has had the good luck to be trained up among very benevolent people, and has had his small original stock prodigiously increased by their precepts and example, aided perhaps by his own large endowment of the faculty of Imitation !—or, his organ of benevolence has perhaps been excited to a diseased activity by some internal inflammation,—or at all events, as he has Love of Approbation and Cautiousness very large, nothing is so probable as that his apparent benevolence is merely put on, to gain the good opinion of the world, or to secure some advantage to himself ! We next produce another person with an enormous bump of Benevolence on his forehead ; and, offering to prove that he is, notwithstanding, notoriously cruel, oppressive, and uncharitable, we ask, again, how this is to be reconciled with the truth of the sys-

tem? O, nothing in the world so easy! First of all, he has probably had no training in the paths of benevolence, and the field, though naturally fertile, has therefore been actually barren; But besides, you have only to look, and you will most probably find the organs of Combativeness, and Destructiveness, and Acquisitiveness, still larger than that of Benevolence. These, of course, make him quarrelsome, and cruel, and avaricious:—and how then can his poor benevolence find means to display itself?—though, *after all*, if you attend carefully to his proceedings, you will find certain stifled traits of benevolence, even in his cruelty!—certain indications that there are kind propensities in his nature, though unluckily overborne, and obscured to common observation, by opposite propensities! It is thus apparent that the phrenological theory, though absolutely *incapable* of any clear or satisfactory proof, abounds in those equivocations and means of retreat, by which it may often escape from direct refutation: And accordingly, whenever we come to actual proof and experiment, we find that the truth of the theory is very quietly *assumed* as a fundamental principle—all contradictory instances, however conclusive, explained on that assumption—and no case, in short, allowed to have any application which does not make in its favour. When we add to this, that the art of correct observation is stated to be extremely difficult—and indeed that no person should be allowed to exercise it, whose head is not of a certain conformation, we may have some idea of the sort of evidence on which its gifted disciples now pretend that it is established.

‘After becoming familiar,’ says Mr Combe, ‘with the general size and configuration of heads, the student may proceed to the *observation of individual organs*; and, in studying them, the *real dimensions*, and not the *mere prominence* of each organ, should be looked for. The *whole organs* in a head should be examined, and their relative proportions noted. *Errors may be committed at first*; but, without practice, there is no expertness. *Practice, with at least an average endowment of the organs of Form, Size, and Locality, are necessary* to qualify a person to make observations with success. *Individuals whose heads are very narrow between the eyes, and little developed at the top of the nose, where these organs are placed, experience great difficulty in distinguishing the situations and minute shades in the proportions of different organs.*’ p. 41.

This is alarming enough. But what follows shows, we think, that even persons with great breadth between the eyes must now and then be in imminent hazard of mistakes.

‘If one organ,’ proceeds the oracular author, ‘be much developed, and the *neighbouring* organ very little, the developed organ presents an elevation or protuberance; *but if the neighbouring organs be developed in proportion, no protuberance can be perceived, and the surface is*

*smooth :* ' and a little after it is added, ' that, when one organ is very largely developed, it sometimes *pushes a neighbouring organ a little out of its place.*'

Now, considering that there are no fewer than five organs of great importance in the line of each eyebrow, it is easy to see in what perplexity an anxious observer may often be placed. If there be no distinct protuberance in this region, how is the smooth surface to be interpreted? It is plain, we suppose, that all the faculties inhabiting it must be held to be in an *equal* degree of vigour: But how are we to determine whether they are all deficient, or all redundant—of an inferior, an average, or an extraordinary development? Suppose, by a happy balance of its faculties, a head should be without any protuberances, and all over as smooth as a barber's block—what are we to infer as to the condition of these equal faculties? Are we to rate them according to its total calibre? and are all sizes to be valued according to actual dimensions?—or with any, and what reference to the general bulk of the body, the stature, weight or form, of the individual? Again, if the organ of Size, being very largely developed, should push the organ of Weight, which stands next it, a little out of its place, and into that of Colouring or of Tune, which immediately adjoin, what terrible errors would ensue? Or if one small organ should unluckily be surrounded by three in a state of great development, would there not be imminent hazard either of its being entirely obliterated by their expansion, or of having its portion of the skull heaved up along with theirs, to a most deceptive and fatal elevation? This, however, is trifling. It is enough, to complete our view of the kind of evidence by which this system is supported, that the observations from which it is to be derived are admitted to be attended with great difficulty and hazard of mistake, and indeed not at all to be trusted to, except in the hands of the initiated!

In what respect, then, do the pretences of Phrenology differ, as to their evidence, from the ordinary cases of pretended Miracles, pretended infallible medicines, pretended expositions of dreams, or of any of the other fancies and impostures by which the credulity of men has been amused, and their love of the marvellous excited, from the beginning of the world? In all these cases there are niceties of operation to be observed, to the neglect of which the failures are in part to be ascribed. There is a determination to count only the few cases that succeed, and to keep out of view the many that fail—there are imputations of prejudice and unfairness to be cast on the unbelievers—and a very strong disposition to make the most of the slightest advantages, to construe a very partial success into a decisive one—and to celebrate a mere mitigation of defeat as a

signal and triumphant victory. A sick man takes an infallible medicine, and is no better—and then, what says the quack for his nostrum?—O, it has been prepared by an unskilful apothecary, and taken in a wrong dose, or at an unfit period—or, it has been counterworked by some improper food or exercise taken along with it—or by some preposterous prescription administered the year before. The medicine itself could not possibly fail—here are fifty attestations of its efficacy, in far worse cases, in as many newspapers! Besides, the patient is quite mistaken in supposing himself no better!—his eye is much brighter, and his pulse more calm. If it had not been for the drug, he would probably have been dead by this time! in fact, it is one of the most surprising of the many cures it has effected! It is needless to say how exactly parallel to this are the reasonings and perversions of the Phrenologists!

But we have something still more decisive to say to them. Their proposition is, that their thirty-six bumps are the organs of so many separate faculties—and that the strength of the endowment is in exact proportion to the size of the bump. Now, independent of all flaws in the theory, we think it can be *proved*, by facts that admit of no denial, that this proposition *neither is, nor can, by possibility, be true*.

In the first place, let us say a word about *Size*. That the mere bulk or *quantity* of matter, in such wonderful and delicate structures, should be the exclusive measure of their value, without any regard to their *quality* or condition, certainly must appear, on the first statement, to be a very improbable allegation;—and we cannot help suspecting, that it was nothing but the plain impossibility of ascertaining any thing as to their structure and quality, that drove our dogmatic theorists upon that bold proposition. Their assumed organs, however, are all buried deep under skin and bone of an uniform appearance; and having nothing, therefore, but size left to go upon, (at least in the living subject), they seem to have even made up their minds to say that that was quite enough—and that nothing else was to be regarded. In the next place, however, the proposition is no less contrary to the analogy of all our known organs than to general probability. The grand-mamma Wolf, in the fairy tale, does indeed lean a little to the phrenological heresy, when she tells little Riding-hood that she has large eyes, to see her the better—and large ears, to hear her the better:—But, with this one venerable exception, we rather think it has never been held before, that the strength of vision depended on the size of the eye, the perfection of hearing on the magnitude of the ear—or the nicety of taste on the

breadth of the tongue or palate. It might also be mentioned as a third circumstance of strong improbability in this theory, that if mere size be the criterion of mental endowment, the most important and purely intellectual of the faculties should have on the whole such very small organs assigned to them. All the reasoning and reflecting powers are crowded into a small area on the forehead and temples—while by far the largest space is allotted to love of progeny, self-conceit, and cowardice. As the masses of the brain seem on the whole to be nearly of one quality, and the very basis of the phrenological system is to take no account of any thing but quantity, it is certainly a little startling to find the least amiable or exalted of our endowments so much more amply provided for than those of a higher order. These, however, we allow, are probabilities only—let us come at length to the facts.

All the world knows, and the Phrenologists themselves admit, that the vigour of any faculty may be improved by exercise and education—and the strength of any propensity by habitual indulgence, though these changes are not accompanied by any increase in the size of the organ. But is not this admitted and most familiar fact in absolute and glaring contradiction to the fundamental assumption of the system? The strength of the faculty is always in exact proportion to the size of its organ. This is their proposition, and, in fact, the whole of their doctrine. But here are two men, with organs of precisely the same size, in one of whom the faculty is, in point of fact, of double the strength as in the other. Is not this a conclusive refutation of their statement? It is nothing to the purpose to say, that the other might have been improved too, and that neither could have been so much improved as if their organs had been larger. These, in the *first* place, are mere *gratis dicta*, without the least vestige of proof; and, *secondly*, they do not touch the decisive fact, that it is thus proved and admitted that the vigour of the faculty does *not* depend, at least *solely*, on the *size* of the organ, but in a great measure on the *quality* either of that organ, or of the mind itself, to which it is supposed to be subservient: And the consequences of that fact are inevitable. If a man, by exercise and education, may have double the talent or energy of another with organs of the same size,—how can it be assumed that size alone is, in any given case, the mark of talent or energy?—or that *other* causes besides exercise and education may not produce those variations, in spite of the equal bulk of the organs? The only safe proposition is, that the size of the organs *absolutely* determines the quantity of talent and energy, as the diameter of a

pipe determines the quantity of water that can be conveyed by it. But if this be given up—if it be admitted that, in many most common cases, the size of the organ is no measure at all of the actual quantity of talent or energy which acts by it, it is plain that the whole game is up; and it is quite impossible to give any reason, why there should not be *primitive* differences of talent, as well as *acquired* differences, with organs of equal size. It is still undeniably true, that, with organs of a certain size, there is a capacity of having a great deal more of all the faculties, than actually belong to many people with that very size of organ; and this, we conceive, at once extinguishes the whole science of phrenology.

But even if there were any grounds for maintaining so strange a distinction, how, we should like to know, are we to discriminate the increments of faculty that have been derived from culture and education, from those that have been developed spontaneously, and should therefore be referred to the native energy of the organs? Education, in this question, plainly cannot be restrained to what is taught in lessons, or inculcated by preceptors. The education by which our faculties are exercised and strengthened, is the education of society, of reflection, of events, of suffering, enjoyment, and experience. It is the education, in short, which is necessarily implied in *living*,—which all men receive, more or less favourably in kind and degree; and to which we ascribe almost all that ultimately distinguishes them from each other, in talents, disposition, manners, morals, and character. If it is according to *this* training and education, that the Phrenologists allow that all our faculties and propensities may be indefinitely strengthened or repressed, what room, we again ask, can be left for their theory? In what sense, or at what period, can it be alleged, that the strength of the faculty is in proportion to the size of its supposed organ? Or of what practical use would it be (even if it were possible) to ascertain, that, before his birth, every man had a certain original peculiarity, when that was to be so soon superseded, and so totally deranged, by the innumerable and untraceable variations in the training to which each was severally to be exposed? The education of which we are now speaking begins long before we are conscious of it, and continues to the last moment of our existence; and, during all that time, it is continually altering, modifying, and new-modelling our character, capacities, and habits. It is impossible to trace its earliest and most important rudiments; and neither these, nor its after course, are the same, we believe, for any two individuals. The Phrenologists seem to us distinctly to admit this generally; and

we do not know that they deny any part of the statement. But if it be admitted, what scope, what field, or materials, can possibly remain for their science? In this view, there is no such thing as a *spontaneous* development; and every intellect and disposition must be regarded as formed and modified by the accidents to which it is exposed. We too, perhaps, believe that men are born with *some* differences of mental capacity and disposition—though we have no idea that they are indicated by bumps on the skull. But, believing as we do, that these are utterly insignificant, compared with the far greater differences which time and events afterwards impress on them, we are convinced it is impossible, and would be idle if it were possible, to ascertain what may have been their original indications. We think it probable, that some have *originally* a greater excitability or general vivacity of mind than others—and that this is the chief difference. But, considering how variously this may be developed or directed in after life, it seems to us of no sort of importance, whether we call it a *temperament*, and say it is marked by the colour of the hair and the eyes—or maintain that it is a balance of certain powers and propensities, the organs of which are on the skull. If education—that education which no man can either regulate or avoid—is to change all this, and to change it to an indefinite extent, it certainly is not true, that the characters or faculties of grown men are in accordance with these supposed organs—or that the dreams of phrenology can receive any proof from observation—though they may be, as they are, effectually disproved, by the admissions thus extorted from their advocates.

Another means of refutation is supplied by another admission, or rather postulate and principle of the Phrenologists. The energy of any faculty or propensity may be increased, it seems, by any Disease or morbid affection of its organ, without any augmentation of its size. This is a very favourite resource, we find, of these learned authors; and seems to us admirably to illustrate their hostility to common sense. Very many of Dr Gall's discoveries were made it seems in madhouses. He found an insane person under the ungoverned influence of some strong propensity; and almost always found that he had the organ of that propensity enormously large! Now, if the patient had been mad, and in the same key, *from his birth up*, there might have been something in this reasoning—but as there is no example, we believe, of such a case, it seems to us very plain, that madness of a particular character, supervening in mature life, in a person who had lived many years with a remarkably large organ of some propensity, could not, in common sense, be re-

ferred to the size of that organ. The man had the organ of that size for forty years, and was not at all mad, or in any way over-mastered by the propensity it denoted. The natural conclusion then would be, that the size of the organ had nothing to do with the excessive force ultimately developed in the propensity; and the cases would be all cases *against* the phrenological assumption.

But the organs are sometimes diseased or morbidly excited, where there is no madness—and then, though they do not increase in size, the powers and faculties to which they minister become vastly more vigorous. This does savour a little, we think, of materialism—but little enough of common sense. The diseased or morbid state of an organ, it seems, does not disturb or impede, but increases and improves the action of the faculty to which it ministers! This is as if we were to see better for an inflammation in the eye, or to smell or taste more acutely for having ulcerations in our mouths and noses! There are some rare instances, we believe, of a morbid and excessive sensibility in these organs; but by far the most common case is undoubtedly the reverse. With the phrenological organs, however, it is quite opposite. A diseased state of the organ always makes its operations more vigorous and energetic; and no instance is mentioned in which the occasional obscuration of any faculty is referred to such a cause. This, we think, is tolerably ridiculous. But the main thing is, that, in anyway of taking it, the fact proves the very foundation of the system to be false. If a faculty is doubled in vigour by a mere disease of the organ, without any increase of its bulk, then it cannot be true that there is any necessary connection between its bulk and the vigour of the faculty. The imaginary disease has often no other local indication but this increase of mental vigour—and is indeed in most cases plainly imagined or assumed merely to account for that phenomenon. It proves, at all events, that faculties may have a vigour quite incommensurate with the size of their organs—which is *precisely the reverse* of what Phrenology teaches. It proves that the state or quality of the organ, or of something else, quite independent of its size, may determine the state of the faculty,—and that size therefore is no criterion whatever. If we find a man with a very small organ, and a very vigorous manifestation of its supposed faculty, it is to be sure very easy to say, that this is owing, not to the size, but the condition of the organ; but it is saying what fundamentally contradicts the whole phrenological doctrine; and though it introduces another, pretty nearly as absurd, it completely puts an end to the former. A disease in the organ is, after all, but a particular state of



that organ ; and if its only effect upon it is to increase its power and activity as an organ, most people, we should think, would rather describe that state as one of uncommon healthiness and vigour, than one of disease. But whatever it may be called, the fact is, that a certain state of the organ may thus indicate a great improvement of its associated faculty, while its bulk remains as before. But if this be admitted in certain cases, how can it be known that it does not hold in all ? What is called a diseased state of the organ, may be only its most healthy and natural state—and all inferior manifestations of the faculty may be owing to organic ineptitude or disease. And, at all events, assuming that there is a correspondence between the organ and the faculty, is there not much more reason for holding that, in all cases, it is the *state*, and not the *size* of the organ, which determines the force of the faculty, than the reverse ? The cases of education and alleged disease *demonstrate*, that it is *not* always the size ; But there is no such evidence against the supposition that it is always the state or condition exclusively, and that the size, of which alone however phrenology takes cognisance, is purely indifferent.

In some cases our author represents the faculty as inordinately excited by disease in persons who have the organ of very small dimensions ; in others, he is guilty of the *double* absurdity of leaving it to disease to produce any manifestation of the faculty, although the organ has all along been unusually large—as in the following admirable illustration of Destructiveness.

‘ When *excited by intoxication*, the organ sometimes becomes ungovernable ; and hence arises the destruction of glasses, mirrors, chairs, and every frangible object at the close of many a feast. Hence also the temptation, often almost irresistible, experienced by many a worthy citizen, when inebriated, to smash a lamp in his progress home. One gentleman assured me that the lamps have appeared to him, when in this state, as it were twinkling on his path with a wicked and scornful gleam, and that he has frequently lifted his stick to punish their impertinence, when a remnant of reason restrained the meditated blow. In him *Destructiveness is decidedly large*, but, *when sober*, there is not a more excellent person.’ p. 109.

Now, here we have, first of all, a man with a decidedly large organ, who yet, in his sound and natural state, gives no manifestation whatever of the connected propensity—in itself a complete falsification of the theory. But then, when disordered with drink, this naturally quiet person becomes mischievous—that is to say, he comes into the state to which drink and disorder might bring a man with a decidedly *small* organ—and which state, accordingly, is constantly referred to as explaining

how men with small organs have occasionally strong propensities ! We think it would be difficult to devise a more perfect refutation of the whole system.

A third and separate refutation, however, is suggested by another concession, or necessary distinction, of its supporters. There is a difference, they have been obliged to admit, between the *Activity* and the *Power* of their faculties and propensities : and size is the measure of power only—activity not manifesting itself by any peculiarity of outward configuration. This is, no doubt, very candid and plausible ; but, at the same time, it takes away at once one half of their territory : Since it admits that there is one most material element of character, and that extending to all the faculties, sentiments and propensities that go to its formation, as to which this infallible ‘ Science of observation ’ gives no light whatever. It observes size only :—And it is here admitted, that though the size be the same, the activity of the faculties may be exceedingly different, and the intellectual endowment of the individuals, therefore, as to one and all of these faculties, exceedingly different, while Phrenology would pronounce them identical.

But, in the second place, is there in reality any distinction between what is here called *power*, and what is called *activity*, as applied to the 36 phrenological faculties ? Mr Combe is more than usually eloquent on this subject ; and it is but fair, therefore, to let him speak for himself.

‘ There is a great distinction between *power* and *activity* of mind ; and, as size in the organs is *an indication of the former only*, it is proper to keep this difference in view. In *physics*, *power* is quite distinguishable from activity. The balance-wheel of a watch moves with much rapidity, but so slight is its impetus, that a hair would suffice to stop it ; the beam of a steam-engine traverses slow and ponderously through space, but its power is prodigiously great.

‘ In *muscular action*, these qualities are recognised with equal facility as different. The greyhound bounds over hill and dale with animated agility ; but a slight obstacle would counterbalance his momentum, and arrest his progress. The elephant, on the other hand, rolls slowly and heavily along ; but the impetus of his motion would sweep away an impediment sufficient to resist fifty greyhounds at the summit of their speed.

‘ In mental manifestations (considered apart from organization), the distinction between power and activity is equally palpable. Many members of the learned professions display great felicity of illustration and fluency of elocution, surprising us with the *quickness* of their parts, who, nevertheless, are felt to be neither impressive nor profound. They possess acuteness without power, and ingenuity without comprehensiveness and depth of understanding. This also pro-

ceeds from activity with little vigour. There are other public speakers, again, who open heavily in debate, their faculties acting slowly, but deeply, like the first heave of a mountain wave. Their words fall like minute-guns upon the ear, and to the superficial they appear about to terminate, ere they have begun their efforts. But even their first accent is one of power, it rouses and arrests attention; their very pauses are expressive, and indicate gathering energy to be embodied in the sentence that is to come. When fairly animated, they are impetuous as the torrent, brilliant as the lightning's beam, and overwhelm and take possession of feeblér minds, impressing them irresistibly with a feeling of gigantic power.' pp. 36-38.

Now, these are very well drawn pictures; and do credit to the author's powers of observation, as well as of writing—being very nearly as true as rhetorical descriptions can ever be: But the rhetoric is better than the logic, if the author really means to assert, that the slowness with which great energies are sometimes developed is to be regarded as their necessary attendant. If a steam-engine or elephant moves slow, a cannon-shot, a war-horse, a thunderbolt, a comet, move fast: And, beyond all doubt, the most fervid orators, the most sublime poets, the most famous warriors, and the most commanding geniuses in all departments, have been remarkable for the combined depth and rapidity of their conceptions: The slowness, when it does occur, is not a symptom of greatness, but a defect or an accident. It arises sometimes from diffidence, sometimes from want of preparation, sometimes from general indolence of temper, sometimes from affectation. This, however, is of little consequence to the present argument. The question we would now ask is, whether it is not plain that these emphatic distinctions are really without meaning as applicable to different conditions of the 36 phrenological faculties; and whether, with regard to the far greater part of them, activity and power, are not perfectly synonymous and undistinguishable? In all the instances quoted, activity seems to mean rapidity of outward motion, and nothing else; and accordingly, it is afterwards (p. 49) expressly defined as denoting 'the rapidity or readiness with which the faculties may be manifested.' Now, let us see whether this does not coincide in almost every instance with any conception that can be framed of their Power, and whether the remainder are not of a nature to which it is impossible intelligibly to ascribe this attribute? When we say, for example, that a man has Destructiveness unusually powerful, what do we mean but that he is unusually *ready* to injure and destroy! All men have something, it seems, of this amiable propensity; and the only difference is, that those who have it least are the *slowest* to give way to it—and those who have it most, the *quick-*

*est.* The whole difference, therefore, is in what is here called its *activity*. A difference in *power* must belong to the muscles of the hand or arm, and not to the brain at all. Combativeness is manifestly in the very same predicament. Can a man be very irascible who is 'slow to anger?' or did Shakespeare ignorantly depict his Combative Youth, only as 'sudden 'and quick in quarrel?' In what other sense can we conceive of the faculties of Colour, Form, Size, and all the others that are supposed to minister to our perceptions of external objects? How is a man, with a powerful endowment of Colour, to be distinguished from one who has it moderate, but by his having a more *quick*, fine, and ready perception of the differences and harmonies of tints and shades? Is there any possibility, as to these faculties, of applying the poetical similitudes of Mr Combe as to elephants and steam-engines, and the slow but resistless movements of giants? or how should we picture to ourselves a mighty colourist, bringing his tardy energies to act in a flower-garden, and labouring towards a tremendous manifestation of his faculty, while another, with a small but active organ, is flitting over the mingled hues, like a sunbeam or a butterfly? But the absurdity is not less conspicuous as to most of the other faculties. If a man has a large organ of Hope, what *can* that indicate, but that he hopes *promptly, rapidly*, and frequently? If he have much Wit, does not that imply that sparkling thoughts and apt allusions come to him *rapidly*, copiously, and easily? Does not a large endowment of Language necessarily mean, that there is a ready flow of words, a prompt recollection, a copious and rapid elocution? What is Imitation, but a quick perception and ready faculty of copying the peculiarities that are set before us? What Individuality, higher or lower, but an instant and rapid observation and disentanglement of fleeting events or complicated appearances? What Locality, but a swift conception and ready recollection of places transiently seen? What Cautiousness, but a quick sense of danger—a most prompt and vigilant circumspection for security? What Ideality itself, but an *aptitude* to catch fire from the common presentments of nature and society,—and, 'with an eye glancing 'from heaven to earth—from earth to heaven'—to body forth its swift creations, and irradiate the dull realities of life with the visitations of its lightnings?

In all these cases, and in many more, we can have no other idea of *the power* of any faculty, than one which answers exactly to Mr Combe's definition of its *activity*. It is in its extraordinary activity, in short, and nothing else, that its extraordinary power consists; and since it is admitted that activity is *not* indicated either by bumps on the skull, or any other visible pecu-

liarity, there is an end, we must think, to the whole science of Phrenology.

This is plainly the case with the far greater part of the phrenological faculties. But there are some, as to which it seems impossible to speak intelligibly of their tendency to 'rapid manifestation.' Adhesiveness, for instance, is the faculty by which we continue constant and devoted in our attachments—and Concentrativeness that which makes us vigorous and persevering in intellectual pursuits. It is possible, perhaps, to conceive of such faculties,—and of their existing more *powerfully* in some individuals than in others. But we strive in vain to form an idea of their comparative activity,—or as our author defines it, their tendency to 'rapid manifestation.' They are quiescent, constant, and unvarying propensities. They have no separate or proper *action* of their own—but merely urge forward, or preserve steady, by their weight and pressure, the other faculties, of loving or reasoning, to which they are auxiliary. The case is nearly the same with Firmness, Secretiveness, Self-esteem, and Conscientiousness. They do not express mental *actions*, in any intelligible sense of the word—and there is no meaning therefore in talking of *the rapidity* with which they may operate. They are *qualities* perhaps of the understanding—But they are necessarily constant and permanent qualities—and cannot be imagined to vary according to the *rapidity*, but only according to the strength, of their manifestations.

It is needless, however, to go farther into this part of the criticism—which is intended only to show the extreme looseness of the phrenological philosophy, even on points the most fundamental and elementary. The thing to be attended to is, that the activity of the faculties is confessedly independent of the size of their organs, or any other external indication; while, in almost all cases, it is impossible to distinguish between the effect of their activity, and what is called their power. If this be made out to the reader's satisfaction, he can require, we should think, no other refutation of the whole system.

There is a fourth, however, and that totally independent of admissions, to be derived from the changes that are so familiarly observed to take place in the characters and propensities of men, in the course of their lives—while the elevations on their skulls remain as they were from the beginning. According to the Phrenologists, character should always be indelible, or affected only by physical accidents on the head. According to fact and observation, it is liable to the greatest revolutions, in consequence merely of events and moral experience—the head, as a physical mass, continuing of its original form and dimen-

sions: And those alterations are most commonly observed to take place in the propensities which make the most conspicuous figure in the phrenological arrangement. Is there any thing so common, for instance, as to see a young spendthrift turned into an old miser?—a man who was scandalously prodigal from 20 to 40, becoming extravagantly avaricious from 50 to 80? But how is this to be reconciled with the stationary condition of his organ of Acquisitiveness, through both these opposite stages? Is it at all unusual for one who was a scoffer in his youth, to become most humbly and zealously devout in his maturer age? And as even the Phrenologists do not allege that there is in these cases any sudden development of the organ of Veneration, may we not be allowed to explain them by their obvious moral causes? That reflection has been suddenly awakened by danger or affliction—that attention has been roused by the impassioned eloquence of some great preacher, or that errors of opinion have been detected by more careful reasoning. What, again, is more ordinary, than to see a generous confiding disposition soured into misanthropy and distrust,—not by any subsidence of the bump of Benevolence, but by the experience of some signal perfidy and ingratitude? What more familiar than the change from the gay, social spirit of early youth, to the despondency of the melancholy recluse?—and this produced by no change certainly in the organs of the head, but by sudden accidental calamity—by the loss of beloved objects—by the harsh closing of the avenues of ambition? Are there not many amorous youths who degenerate into absolute woman-haters in their middle age?—many abstemious lads who ripen speedily into luxurious sensualists?—many who enter life bashful and diffident, and in no long time become patterns of assurance?—nay, many who have long conducted themselves with the most scrupulous integrity, who are at last corrupted into abominable knaves? There is no end to the detail of these revolutions. They are the story of every family, the gossip of every one who has lived with observation in the world. But they are absolutely irreconcilable with the truth of the Phrenological theory—and, therefore, we must conclude that that theory cannot be true.

The last and most effectual, or at least most tangible refutation of it, is deduced from the actual want of any thing like distinct organs in the brain—as well as from observation of the effects produced, or *not* produced, on the faculties, by injuries to those parts which that theory holds to be their necessary organs.

The followers of Gall and Spurzheim talk much, we know, of their discoveries in anatomy. We have no great faith, we

confess, in those discoveries: But the writer of these observations is not learned in anatomy;—and although he has been assured by those who are, that all that is true in their account of the brain, had been previously established by Reil and others, it is really of no consequence to the present argument to come to any decision on this part of their pretensions. Let the white part of the brain be as exclusively fibrous, and the grey part as plainly its aliment as they please to represent it,—and let them have as much credit as they choose to take, for these and other discoveries: The important, and *the only important* anatomical fact, in this controversy, is a fact unequivocally against them—and of itself, we think, conclusive upon the question of evidence. They say they have discovered 36 bumps on the skull, and that these correspond with as many elevations on the exterior surface of the brain. But they do not say, and cannot pretend that they find any thing in the *interior structure* or arrangement of that substance, corresponding with those 36 organs. They are pleased, indeed, to *imagine* that they are continued back, in a tapering or conical form, from these their projecting terminations on the surface, till they converge somewhere at the top of the spinal marrow; *But they do not pretend* that the brain itself is actually divided into 36 such cones—that they can dissect them out as such, or demonstrate their course and separation by any sort of perceptible boundary. The whole of their organs, in short, are *substantially admitted to be imaginary*—the only indications of their separate existence being certain obscure protuberances on the mere *surface* of a body that is virtually homogeneous—and through the substance of which it is impossible to trace them to any extent whatever. There are convolutions in the brain, familiarly known to anatomists, and a white and a grey matter distributed in unequal masses. The phrenological Doctors pretend to have made discoveries as to the structure of these two kinds of matter, and the subserviency of the one to the other, and also as to the possibility of unfolding the convolved masses, and the decussation of the fibrous parts. *But they do not pretend* that they have found the brain actually divided into 36 cones, or organs of any other shape; that there is any kind of inward separation or distinction of structure corresponding with the superficial boundaries of their supposed organs; or that they are disjoined in short, or disconnected from each other, by any kind of membrane, fibre, or variety of texture or colour.\* In short, though they are

---

\* Even if there were 36 cones in the brain, it would be rather strange if they turned out to be the organs of 36 different faculties—considering that they are assumed to be all of one and the same structure and form,

here assumed and boldly represented as separate cerebral organs, the superficial projections of which are merely the croppings out of their internal organization, *the fact is*, that these superficial projections are all they have to show for their existence,—that they have no separate internal organization that can be traced or exhibited,—and that their description, as 36 distinct portions of the brain, reaching back in separate cones to the *medulla oblongata*, is a *mere fiction or fancy*,—in support of which the most keen and partial observation has been able to elicit no particle of evidence. We doubt whether an extravagant hypothesis was ever propounded before, with such a glaring deficiency, even of probable or preliminary evidence. If no skull had ever been looked into, it might or might not have been a plausible conjecture, that the bumps observed on the living head, were the terminations of certain interior organs; But when the head was laid open after death, *and no such organs were found*, the conjecture, one would think, must at once have been retracted as erroneous. The refutation could hardly have been more complete, if the skull had been found full of pure water: For the supposition of there being 36 separate organs in a continuous

---

and differing only in the size and shape of their superficial terminations. They are all cones, we are told, of the same fibrous and pulpy white and grey matter, without any variety of inward structure and arrangement. Now, certainly, in the only organs of which we know any thing, there is no such wondrous uniformity. The eye is a machine of a very different structure from the ear—the olfactory apparatus radically distinct from the gustatory. It would be strange, therefore, if we Venerated the Deity, and were impelled to break lamps, by the state of two cones, of the same substance, lying under one bone! But there are no such cones; nor any traces of the 36 organs, except the elevations at the surface. The convolutions are mere foldings of a continuous mass, and do not correspond at all, either in shape, number, size or place, with the phrenological organs. In Spurzheim's last edition of his *Anatomy of the Brain*, accordingly, which we have only seen since writing the above, we find him stating (Edition 1826, p. 206,) that ‘the nervous energy depends in a great measure on ‘the quantity of *surface*, far more indeed than on the ‘quantity of nervous matter.’ It is edifying to find it recorded in the same work, that Gall substantially admitted that, ‘if he were shown the ‘alleged organs of Acquisitiveness, Destructiveness, or Veneration, (meaning plainly their superficial protuberances) ‘apart from the rest of the ‘brain, *he certainly would not know them!*’ What should we think of a physiologist who would not know an eye from an ear, if separated from the head? It farther appears, from the same valuable document, that a new organ, entitled *Mirthfulness*, has been discovered since Mr Combe's book was written—though we cannot exactly ascertain which of the old ones has been suppressed to make room for it.



and homogeneous mass, must be allowed to be equally extravagant, whether that mass be wholly or only partially fluid.

The next set of facts, however, appear to us still more conclusive. If these 36 protuberances be really the necessary organs of as many separate faculties, it must follow, that when any one of them is injured or destroyed, the corresponding faculty must be impaired, or its exercise for the time suspended. Now, in all the woundings, knockings and trepanings, to which human heads have been subjected for the last 4000 years, though a *general* stupor, or suspension of *all* the faculties, has been often enough observed to accompany those inflictions, we are not aware that they have ever been known to produce the extinction of *particular faculties*, according to the part of the head on which they occurred.\* Nay, we learn from Dr Ferriar's papers in the Manchester Transactions, and from Mr Rennel's late publication, that a prodigious variety of cases have been recorded, in which large portions of the brain have been actually destroyed, and that in so many different parts of the head, as successively to dispose of all the phrenological organs, without affording a single instance of such a partial destruction of intellect, as *must* have followed, if their system were true, from this partial destruction of its organs. There is a long, cavilling, pertinacious argument in the volume before us, upon these truly alarming facts:—into the details of which we have no longer room to enter. The substance of it seems to be, that the cases are not exactly in point—that the dull surgical observers may not have been aware of the loss of the injured faculty—and in par-

---

\* There ought, perhaps, to be an exception for Amativeness—at least to this extent, that injuries on the *cerebellum* generally seem to affect this propensity. This, however, makes nothing for the Phrenological system. Amativeness is an affection or sensation of the body only—and prompts to mere bodily movements. It seems probable, from the experiments alluded to, that the nerves upon which these sensations depend, are derived from this part of the brain. It is certain, however, that *the same effects* are produced by any interception of their course to the parts of the body more immediately concerned in these sensations, or by the mutilation of their more immediate organs. All bodily sensations depend on a bodily apparatus. Hunger and thirst are rightly referred, we think, to uneasy sensations in the stomach and fauces;—and though the nerves which minister to these sensations originate in the brain or spinal marrow, there is no more sense in saying that they have an Organ in the brain, than if we were to say that there was an organ there for gout, tooth-ach, or whitlow. According to the experiments of M. Fleurens, the cerebellum is much more like the organ of voluntary Motion, than of Amativeness, or Love of Offspring.

ticular, that they may not have attended to the fact that, each faculty having a *double set* of organs—one in each hemisphere of the brain, the injuries may not have extended to both, and the faculty may therefore have operated by the side that remained sound. In a matter so plain, we really do not think it necessary to go very minutely or elaborately to work. A man's head, according to the Phrenologists, is embossed all over with the protuberant organs of his different faculties—and other people admit, that it exhibits the organs of at least four such faculties. If, in a common boxing-match, he gets a closer on the eyes, it requires no nice medical skill to know that the sight will be injured, or that a good blow on the ear will make him deaf for a longer or shorter time. Accordingly, from the beginning of time, these effects have been universally known to follow from these injuries. But blows light at least as often on other parts of the head as on the eye or ear. They *must* light, therefore, according to the Phrenologists, on the organ of some other faculties;—and the question is, how—if the phrenological system were true—it could at this time of day be doubted, whether other specific faculties were injured by such blows—or how there should possibly be any need, and still less any difficulty, in producing evidence of that plain proposition? So far from being a matter of rare occurrence, or as to which there could be any room for cavilling about cases in point—it is obvious that cases in point must have been occurring every day, in the sight of almost every man in existence. To say nothing of battles—and the hacking of troopers' heads with sabres and broad swords—there is not a Wake or Fair in Ireland, at which cases of injury on all the thirty-six bumps may not be obtained in multitudes: And yet nobody has ever observed the disturbance of any *special* faculty, but those of seeing and hearing—nor have either patients or lookers-on been the least aware of any difference in the mental effects of the blows, according to the quarter of the head on which they descended. If they struck the eye or ear, to be sure, the man grew blind or deaf. But if they fell any where else, he merely reeled, or fell, or vomited; but was conscious of no cessation in the functions of any particular mental power or propensity. A soldier shot or struck on the eyes, may cry out, 'I am dark for life! my precious eye-sight!—But if hit hard on the organ of Veneration, is never heard to exclaim, 'There! my religion is clean gone! 'I care nothing now for God, or the Captain.' A tender father wounded on the organ of Philoprogenitiveness, feels no sudden disregard for his children. A miser, well banged on the organ of Acquisitiveness, does not instantly become careless of his money bags; nor is a coward, whose large bump of Cautious-

ness has been half beaten in by ruffians, in any degree cured of his timidity.

The double sets of organs are of very little consequence in the argument. Though a man has two eyes, he knows very well when one of them is knocked out; and a man deaf on one side, is perfectly conscious of a defect in his hearing. Something analogous, therefore, should at all events take place, when one member of a phrenological pair is disabled; and it should be just as common to hear a friend complaining, that he had not been able to reason on the left side, or to make a joke with the right, the whole winter, as it now is to hear him say, that *he* cannot smell with the right nostril, or see with the left eye. \* But besides that, in very many cases, the injuries extend to parts of both hemispheres, it happens that there is a range of very conspicuous faculties at their conjunction, the organs of which, though nominally double, are quite contiguous, and therefore substantially single; so that every injury must necessarily affect the whole. Of this class are the two Individualities, Comparison, Benevolence, Veneration, Firmness, and Love of Offspring; while the double organs of Locality, Causality, Time, and Imitation, though not absolutely in contact, are yet so near each other, as to make it very unlikely that they should not both be involved in any misfortune that befall either. It is obvious, too, that these, as occupying the front, top, and centre of the head, are more liable to blows and accidents than any of the others; and as the casualties, to which we have referred, are of so very common occurrence, the tests which we would apply could never be wanting, even if they alone had the means of supplying them.

As to the cases in which large parts of the brain have been actually destroyed or removed, and from all places of the head, without the perceptible loss of any particular faculty, we cannot see that any answer either is or can be made to them—and conceive that they settle, by redundant evidence, a question which can no longer be considered as doubtful. Here, however, is a specimen of the facts which are pressed into the service of Phrenology.

---

\* It is rather remarkable, that our Phrenologists take no notice of this duplication of the organs, when treating of the vigour which the faculties may receive from their morbid excitement. Yet it would perplex that argument, if otherwise available to them, far more than the present. If the faculty of Destructiveness is excited by a local inflammation above one ear, while that on the other side is not so affected, what will be the condition of the mental faculty? Will it have fits of morbid manifestation and remission, as the party brings one or the other organ into play? Or will it compromise the matter by a permanent half excitement?

' A man was brought into an hospital, who had received a considerable injury of the head, but from which he ultimately recovered. When he became convalescent, he spoke a language which no one about him could comprehend. However, a *Welsh* milk-woman came one day into the ward, and immediately understood what he said. It appeared that this poor fellow was a *Welshman*, and had been from his native country about thirty years. In the course of that period, *he had entirely forgotten his native tongue*, and acquired the *English* language. But when he recovered from his accident, he forgot the language he had been so recently in the habit of speaking, and acquired the knowledge of that which he had originally acquired and lost! Such a fact as this is totally inexplicable on any principle except that of *the existence of organs by which the faculties are manifested*; for it could not be the mind itself which was affected, and its faculties impaired by the fever, or which recovered long lost knowledge, by the influence of this disease.' pp. 395.

We shall not attempt certainly to *explain* this, and some similar cases, which seem respectably attested. But we must say, that we find it much easier to let them pass for the present as inexplicable, than to acquiesce in the phrenological solution. It will be remembered, that they have now left us no organ of Memory, and therefore the injury in question must have affected some part of the organ of Language—to which the recollection of words is committed, on their present scheme. This organ, to be sure, is situated behind the eye—and we have no hint that the *Welshman's* eyes were affected. But let that pass—The phenomenon is explained by supposing that a part of the organ of language was injured—and that the effects of this injury were, 1st, to *destroy* for the time that part of the machinery which served for the recollection of *English* words—and, 2d, to *restore* to a servicable state that part which had been originally used for recollecting *Welsh* ones, but had long been so much rusted and decayed, as to be quite unfit for service. These are not metaphors employed to assist our conception of an obscure fact, or to give a sort of coherence to a strange statement. They are alleged by the Phrenologists as serious and literal truths, affording a plain and satisfactory explanation of a very extraordinary occurrence. It is difficult for any one else to be serious in speaking of such an explanation. For it substantially amounts to this, that there is an actual part or portion of the brain, whose function it is to suggest *Welsh* words and their meaning—and another to suggest *English* words—and that, by a knock on the head, one of these organs (for they are separate organs to all intents and purposes) may be made incapable of working—and the other re-enabled to work, after a long period of incapacity. If there be any truth in this, the 36 organs should be multiplied,

not by hundreds but thousands. There must be an actual material polyglott in every man's head—a separate 'volume in the brain' for every language that he learns—and a reserve, of course, of blank ones for every language he is capable of learning—nay, there must be a distinct line, of a few actual fibres, for every separate word—and not for every word only, but for every thing and idea of every sort—for all, in short, that may be either learned or forgotten! An old musician, by a lucky blow on the head, may have the sealed volume thrown open, where tunes, forgotten since infancy, are fairly pricked down—a mathematician may stumble on his lost equations—a gourmand recover his perished ragouts! For every separate conception, in short, of which the mind is capable, we have only to assume that there is a certain material receptacle in the brain, and all the phenomena of thought are explained in the simplest and most satisfactory manner—taking care always to assume, at the same time, just such accidents and changes in those material organs as will exactly account for the phenomena in question!

We must absolutely end here, we find;—though there is much goodly matter behind. There is a great deal about 'the modes' of activity of the organs,' which we confess passes our understanding; and we must bear the same testimony to the dissertations on the Harmony of the Faculties, and the practical applications of the science, to the treatment of Insanity, and to Criminal Legislation. But we must hurry away at once from all these seductions; and leave the book and the science at length to their fate. We have already given more attention to them, than many of our readers will probably approve, or indeed than we ourselves think they deserve—though probably not enough to have avoided some errors, and many imperfections, in our hasty statement. We have left room enough, we dare say, for cavil and misrepresentation, on the part of those who think these the best weapons of controversy. It is not, however, to them that we address ourselves—and we care nothing at all for their hostility. We have no objections to Phrenology, as an amusement for idle people, and as a means, perhaps, of tempting them into a taste for reflection; and to those good ends this free exposition of its fallacy is likely, we think, to contribute. But the dogmatism and arrogance of its advocates were really beginning to be tiresome—and the folly had lasted rather too long. It would no doubt have declined of itself in no very long time; and in supposing that we may have now done something to accelerate its cessation, we are probably vainly arrogating to ourselves an honour that will belong entirely to the progress of reason—or the fortunate distraction of some newer delusion.

**ART. II. MR JACOB'S *Report on the Trade in Corn, and on the Agriculture of the North of Europe.* Printed by order of the House of Commons 14th March 1826.**

**I**N whatever point of view the question with respect to the Abolition or modification of the existing Corn Laws may be considered—whether as affecting the interests of the landlords and farmers, or those of the manufacturing, mercantile, and monied classes—it must be allowed to be one of the very highest importance. And as it is obvious, as well from the proceedings that took place last Session in the House of Commons, as from those that have since taken place out of doors, that this great question must speedily be agitated in Parliament, we make no apology for again endeavouring to excite the public to an attentive consideration of its merits. We do not certainly think that it is in itself a difficult question; but it is one with respect to which the greatest misapprehensions are universally entertained. The deceitful statements and declamatory harangues of the agricultural orators on the one hand, and the intemperate invectives of many of their opponents on the other, have given rise to the most erroneous and contradictory opinions with respect to the practical bearing and real operation of the existing Corn Laws, and the effects that would follow from their repeal; and have rendered a patient investigation of facts, and a recurrence to first principles, indispensable to clear away the obscurity in which the question has been studiously involved, and to enable us to arrive at a sound conclusion with respect to it.

In order to simplify our investigation, we shall begin by endeavouring to estimate the total annual consumption of the different kinds of grain in the British empire; and, having done this, we shall next endeavour to ascertain the quantity of grain that would most probably be imported into Great Britain in ordinary years, and the price at which it could be sold in the event of the ports being thrown open. If we succeed in determining these points with tolerable accuracy, it will be easy to deduce from them an estimate of *the effect* that a repeal of the Corn Laws would have in reducing the price of raw produce, and in throwing inferior land out of tillage. The facts of the case being thus brought before the reader, we shall next apply ourselves to unfold the consequences which they involve, and to exhibit the principles that ought to be kept in view, in abo-

lishing or modifying the existing restrictions. We shall endeavour to be as brief as possible; but the importance of the subject, and the multiplicity of details which it involves, render a pretty large discussion absolutely unavoidable.

Attempts have sometimes been made to compute the quantity of corn raised in a country, from calculations founded on the number of acres in tillage, and on the average produce *per* acre. But it is plain that no accurate estimate can ever be framed of the extent of land under cultivation. It is perpetually changing from year to year; and the amount of produce varies not only with the differences of seasons, but also with every improvement of agriculture. This method, therefore, is now rarely resorted to; and the growth of corn is generally estimated from the *consumption*. The conclusions deduced from this criterion must indeed be subject to error, as well from variations in the consumption, occasioned by variations in the price of corn, as from the varying extent to which other food is used. But supposing the prices of corn to be reduced to an average, if the consumption of a considerable number of persons of all ranks and orders, and of all ages and sexes, were accurately determined, we should be able, supposing the census of the population to be nearly correct, to make a very close approximation to the total consumption of the country. Mr Charles Smith, the well-informed and intelligent author of the *Tracts on the Corn Trade*, made many curious investigations with a view to discover the mean annual consumption of corn; and, reducing it to the *standard of wheat*, he found it to be at the rate of about *a quarter for each individual*, young and old. This estimate has been confirmed by a variety of subsequent researches; and, among others, by inquiries made during the scarcity of 1795 and 1796 by the Magistrates of Suffolk, in 42 different parishes, in the view of ascertaining the average consumption of each family, which they found to correspond very closely with Mr Smith's estimate. It is also worthy of remark, that M. Paucton, the intelligent author of the *Metrologie*, estimates the mean annual average consumption in France, when reduced to the standard of wheat, at about 10 bushels for each individual; and as the French consume considerably more bread, and less animal food, than the English, this estimate affords a strong proof of the correctness of that of Mr Smith.

Having taken the population of England and Wales, in 1765, at 6,000,000, Mr Smith reckoned the consumers of each kind of grain, the quantity consumed by each individual, and hence the whole consumed by man, to be as follows:—

Estimated Popu- lation of England and Wales.	Average Con- sumption of each person.	Consumed by Man. <i>Quarters.</i>
3,750,000 consumers of wheat, at one quarter each		3,750,000
739,000 do. of barley, at $1\frac{1}{2}$ do.	- -	1,016,125
888,000 do. of rye, at $1\frac{1}{2}$ do.	- -	999,000
623,000 do. of oats, at $2\frac{1}{2}$ do.	- -	1,791,225
Consumed by man,		7,556,350
In addition to this, Mr Smith estimated the wheat dis- tilled, made into starch, &c.	- -	90,000
Barley used in malting, &c.	- -	3,417,000
Rye for hogs, &c.	- -	31,000
Oats for horses, &c.	- -	2,461,500
Total of home consumption,		13,555,850
Add excess of exports over imports,		398,624
		13,954,474
Add seed, <i>one-tenth</i> ,		1,395,447
Total growth of all kinds of grain in England and Wales, in 1765,		15,349,921

This estimate, it will be observed, does not include either Scotland or Ireland; and later inquiries have rendered it probable that Mr Smith had underrated the population of England and Wales by nearly one million. The most eminent agriculturists seem also to be of opinion, that the allowance for seed ought to be stated as high as a *seventh*.

Mr Chalmers, availing himself of the information respecting the numbers of the people, furnished under the Population Act of 1800, estimated the total consumption of all the different kinds of grain in Great Britain at that epoch, at 27,185,300 quarters, whereof wheat constituted 7,676,100 quarters. The crops of 1800 and of 1801 being unusually deficient, the importation in these years was proportionally great; but excluding these scarcities, the total average excess of all sorts of grain imported from Ireland and foreign countries into Great Britain over the exports, had previously amounted to about one million of quarters, which, deducted from 27,185,300, leaves 26,185,300, to which, if we add *one-seventh* as seed, we shall have 29,925,057 quarters, as the average growth of Great Britain, in 1800.

The population of Ireland, as ascertained by the census of 1821, amounts to very near seven millions. The greatest por-



tion of its inhabitants are, it is true, supported by the potato, and seldom or never taste bread; but we shall probably be within the mark if we estimate the number of those fed on the various kinds of corn at three millions, and the average quantity of the different sorts of grain consumed by each individual at two quarters. This would give 6,000,000 of quarters as the total consumption of Ireland.

But the population of Great Britain has increased since 1800 from 10,942,000 to 14,379,000; and both Mr Western and Dr Colquhoun concurred in estimating the average consumption of the whole empire in 1812 and 1814, at about thirty-five millions of quarters.

The following is Dr Colquhoun's estimate:—

SPECIES OF GRAIN.	Estimated Average of the Population of Great Britain and Ireland.	Each person averaged.	Consumed by Man.	Consumed by Animals.	Used in Beer and Spirits.	Used in va- rious Ma- nufactures.	Total of Quarters.
		<i>Quarters.</i>	<i>Quarters.</i>	<i>Quarters.</i>	<i>Quarters.</i>	<i>Quarters.</i>	
Wheat, .	9,000,000	1	9,000,000			170,000	9,170,000
Barley, .	1,500,000	1½	1,875,000	210,000	4,250,000		6,335,000
Oats .	4,500,000	1½	6,750,000	10,200,000			16,950,000
Rye, .	500,000	1¼	625,000	59,000		1,000	685,000
Beans & Peas, }	500,000	1	500,000	1,560,000			1,860,000
Totals .	16,000,000		18,750,000	11,829,000	4,250,000	171,000	35,000,000

Dr Colquhoun has made no allowance for seed in this estimate; and there can be no doubt that he has underrated the consumption of oats by at least one-half quarter in the consumption of each of the 4,500,000 individuals he supposes fed on them, or by 2,250,000 quarters. Adding, therefore, to Dr Colquhoun's estimate five and a half millions of quarters for seed, and 2,250,000 quarters for the deficiency of oats, it will bring it to 42,750,000 quarters. And taking the increase of population since 1813 into account, it does not appear to us that the annual average consumption of the different kinds of grain in the United Kingdom can now be estimated at less than FORTY-two millions of quarters, exclusive of seed, and at FORTY-EIGHT millions when it is included. Assuming this estimate to be correct, and the proportion of wheat to amount to *twelve* millions of quarters, the progressive consumption will be as follows:—

*Consumption of Wheat and other Grain in the United Kingdom, in a year, six months, a month, a week, &c.*

	Wheat. Quarters.	Other Grain. Quarters.	Total Quarters.
A Year, -	12,000,000	36,000,000	48,000,000
Six Months, -	6,000,000	18,000,000	24,000,000
Three Months, -	3,000,000	9,000,000	12,000,000
Six Weeks, -	1,500,000	4,500,000	6,000,000
One Month, -	1,000,000	3,000,000	4,000,000
Two Weeks, -	500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000
One Week, -	250,000	750,000	1,000,000
One Day, -	35,714	107,143	142,857

Several very important conclusions may be drawn from this Table. And, in the first place, it shows, that the largest importations that have ever taken place, bear but a very small proportion to the total consumption of the country. It appears, from papers printed by order of the House of Commons, that the total imports of wheat from all parts of the world, from the year 1800 to 1820 both inclusive, amounted to only 12,577,029 quarters, giving an annual average of no more than 589,906 quarters. It will also be observed, that the *average price* of that period was as high as 81s. 6d., and that it included *five* years of decided scarcity, and when the home prices rose to a most oppressive height. We subjoin a note of these years, with the prices and *the total quantities of ALL SORTS of grain* imported into Great Britain from foreign countries.

1800	-	110s. 5d.	-	2,135,597 quarters.
1801	-	115s. 11d.	-	2,405,544
1810	-	103s.	-	1,688,268
1817	-	94s.	-	1,797,181
1818	-	83s. 8d.	-	3,522,729

Now, it appears from this *official* statement, that notwithstanding the ruinously high prices of these years, and although every corner of the commercial world was ransacked with a view to the supply of the British markets, such is the vastness of our demand, that the total quantity imported rarely amounted to *one-twentieth* part of the entire consumption; and in 1818, which was the year of greatest importation, the foreign corn imported did not amount to *one-thirteenth* part of the required supply, or to *four weeks consumption*! This is, of itself, sufficient to show that nothing can be more perfectly futile than the fears and apprehensions entertained by the agriculturists with respect to the excessive importations of foreign corn that would take place were our ports thrown open.

In 1801 and 1802, when the price of wheat in England amounted upon an average to 92s. 10d. per quarter, and in Dantzic to 67s. 4d. per do., the quantity of wheat exported from the latter amounted to only 945,199 quarters, giving an annual average of 472,599 quarters, of which about three-fourths were sent to England. And to furnish this trifling quantity—for it is but trifling when compared to the total consumption of this country—Mr Jacob mentions, that wheat was brought by land-carriage to the Vistula from the farthest parts of Galicia, and even from Brun and Olmutz in Moravia, at an expense which could not possibly have been defrayed, except by the enormous prices which it then bore in the English market. (*Report*, p. 52.) We subjoin an account, furnished by Mr Jacob, of the total annual average quantity of wheat and rye exported from Dantzic in periods of twenty-five years each, for the 166 years ending with 1825,

Years.	Wheat. Quarters.	Rye. Quarters.	Total Quarters.
1651 to 1675	81,775	225,312	307,087
1676 - 1700	124,897	227,482	352,379
1701 - 1725	59,795	170,100	229,895
1726 - 1750	80,624	119,771	200,395
1751 - 1775	141,080	208,140	349,220
1776 - 1800	150,299	103,045	253,344
1801 - 1825	200,330	67,511	267,841

‘The average of the whole period,’ Mr Jacob observes, ‘gives an annual quantity of wheat and rye, of 279,794 quarters (hardly equivalent to *two days* supply of the British market); and this surplus may be fairly considered as the nearest approach that can be made, with existing materials, to what is the usual excess of the produce of bread corn above the consumption of the inhabitants, when no extraordinary circumstances occur to excite or check cultivation.’—(*Report*, p. 49.)

It appears from the official accounts furnished by Mr Gibson, the very intelligent consul at Dantzic, that the exports of wheat from Riga for the *nine* years beginning with 1816, and ending with 1824, amounted on an annual average to 2,533 lasts, or to 25,330 quarters: And it further appears, from official accounts furnished by the same gentleman, that the exports of wheat from Elbing amount, on an average of the last twelve years, to 21,381 quarters.

It results from these statements, that the total exports of wheat from the three great ports of Dantzic, Riga, and Elbing, amount, on an average of the last ten or twelve years, to less

than 250,000 quarters: And, estimating the total average exports from the other ports of the Baltic at 50,000 quarters, which we believe considerably exceeds the mark, it will be seen that the total exports from all the ports on that sea do not, in ordinary years, amount to 300,000 quarters; which, supposing it were all to come to England, would not be more than equal to eight days supply of our consumption of wheat, or to four days supply of our consumption of all sorts of grain!

It is contended, however, that in the event of the freedom of the corn trade being established, foreigners would regularly calculate upon the demand of Great Britain; and that the extraordinary fertility of the Polish, Prussian, and Russian provinces bordering on the Baltic, would enable their agriculturists to raise a vastly increased quantity of grain, and, by glutting our market with unlimited supplies, to drive all our inferior and middling land out of tillage. But the fact that our ports were open, with scarcely any interruption, from 1795 to 1815, and that, notwithstanding the extraordinary stimulus to importation afforded by the high prices of that period, our imports rarely amounted to *one-twentieth* part of our entire consumption, show that the apprehensions of excessive importation are altogether imaginary. But in order still better to clear up this point, ministers determined to send a gentleman to travel through the countries in question, to collect authentic information with respect to their present state, and their capabilities for producing an increased supply of corn. Much, it is obvious, of the success of this plan was to depend on the qualifications of the individual selected for the mission; and though we are not sure that it might not have been advisable to have associated two or more persons in so important an expedition, we are persuaded that no one individual could have been found better qualified to undertake it than Mr Jacob—the gentleman sent out. Mr Jacob had already visited the North of Germany and Prussia; and besides being advantageously known by the attention he had paid to statistical inquiries, he possessed a competent knowledge of the practical details of agriculture. But the Report produced by him, since his return, is the best proof of his fitness for the mission. It is in every respect a most valuable document. Mr Jacob had access to all the best sources of information; and he has industriously availed himself of them, to furnish the most accurate and minute details with respect to the natural fertility of the soil, the agricultural economy, and the actual condition of the rural population of Prussia and the lower provinces of Poland. The facts and observations he has collected and detailed, show that

the capabilities of the Northern provinces of Poland, and generally of the whole North of Europe, for furnishing an increased supply of corn, are vastly less than had been commonly supposed. Agricultural science is, almost everywhere, at the very lowest ebb; the soil of the provinces contiguous to the sea is thin, sandy, and unproductive; and though the more distant Polish provinces of Massovia, Gallicia, and Volhynia, are comparatively fertile, and might easily be made to furnish a considerable supply of corn for exportation, their great distance from the sea, and the expense attending the carriage of their produce to Dantzic, amounting on an average to from 12s. to 18s. a quarter, oppose almost insuperable obstacles to their ever becoming great exporting countries.

In 1817 and 1818, when our ports were open, and the average price of wheat in Great Britain was as high as 88s. 10d., the total quantity of that grain exported from Dantzic amounted to only 504,934 quarters, being at the rate of 252,467 quarters a year. And had the price of corn in England been so low as 60s., it is doubtful whether the exports in these years would have amounted to 120,000 quarters. Nothing, therefore, can be more completely without foundation, than the notions so generally prevalent with respect to the excessive importations that would take place, under a system of free trade, from the North of Europe. There is no reason to think, were our prices steady at about 50s. or 55s., that we should be able to import above 550,000, or at most 600,000 quarters of all sorts of grain from the whole of Northern Europe. But on the extravagant supposition that we imported double that quantity, or 1,200,000 quarters, it would, after all, amount to only *ONE-FORTIETH part of our culire consumption*. And as our greatest supplies must always be derived from that quarter, it is immediately seen how ridiculous it is to suppose that the perfect freedom of the corn trade could ever have the effect of rendering us in any considerable degree dependent on foreign supplies.

Assuming, however, that our imports should, under a system of free trade, regularly amount to 3,500,000 quarters, as in 1818, when the price was as high as 83s. 8d., still it is obvious that, even on this exaggerated hypothesis, they would fall short of *one-thirteenth* part of the required supply; and, therefore, instead of its being true, as the agriculturists affirm, that a *third* or a *fourth* part of the land now under tillage in this country would be converted into pasture in the event of the ports being thrown open, not more than a *thirteenth* part of our cultivated land could be in any degree affected.

The misapprehensions that are universally entertained with respect to the *price* at which foreign corn could be imported, were our restrictive regulations abolished, are if possible still more extraordinary than those entertained with respect to the quantities that could be imported. One would be disposed to conclude, were they to read only the paragraphs put forth by the more zealous advocates of the agricultural or manufacturing interests—for however much these gentlemen may differ in every thing else they agree in this—that were our Corn Laws abolished, we might obtain unlimited supplies of wheat for 20s. or at most 30s. a quarter! The only thing we have to regret is, that these statements should have no better foundation than the hopes or fears of those by whom they are put forth: For whatever Sir Thomas Lethbridge, or Mr Holme Sumner may say to the contrary, it would be a prodigious advantage to be able to obtain sufficient supplies of food at such a reduced rate. But, unfortunately, the perfect freedom of the corn trade would procure us no such boon. It would indeed be a great and signal benefit, because it would secure us perpetual plenty, and would present an insuperable obstacle to any very oppressive rise of prices in future; but it would not depress them to *one half* the extent commonly supposed. The stories that are everywhere current with respect to the extreme cheapness of foreign corn, are not really entitled to more credit than those in the Arabian Nights. And though our ports were opened, without duties or restrictions of any sort, we are bold to say that not one tittle of evidence has been produced to warrant the conclusion, that foreign corn could be sold in our markets in ordinary years for less than from 48s. to 55s. a quarter.

Dantzic is, of all the Continental markets, that from which we must always derive the greatest supply of corn. But we have already seen, that in 1817 and 1818, with a price of no less than 88s. 10d., we were not able to import more than 252,467 quarters a year! This is certainly very unlike the current reports about the excessive abundance and cheapness of Polish wheat; but, lest it should be said that, owing to our ports being shut in 1815 and 1816, the Poles, not calculating upon our demand, had no corn raised for our markets, we shall endeavour to ascertain what may be considered as the lowest price for which any considerable quantity of wheat, as 100,000 or 200,000 quarters, might, in ordinary years, be obtained for from Dantzic. It is not, of course, possible to determine such a point with perfect accuracy; but the statements we are now about to lay before our readers are sufficiently precise for all practical purposes.

The first authority to which we shall refer is that of Mr

Oddy, the intelligent author of the work on European Commerce, published in 1805. Mr Oddy visited Dantzic, and most other ports on the Baltic; and, having carefully inquired into the facts of the case, he states, that 32s. 6d. a quarter is *the lowest price* for which any considerable supply of wheat could be purchased at Dantzic. (p. 250.) In like manner, Mr Solly, an extensive corn merchant, who was formerly in business at Dantzic, stated to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons in 1821, that when there was *no direct foreign demand*, a quarter of wheat might be put on board ship at Dantzic for about 35s.; that the freight to London would be about 4s. 6d. or 5s. more; and that the expense attending its unloading and warehousing there, would be an additional 3s.; making its price to the importer about 43s. a quarter. (Report, p. 316.) Mr Solly further stated, that when the foreign demand was considerable, the price was much higher; and, according to the data given in his evidence, it is plain that fine Dantzic wheat could not be imported into London, in ordinary years, in the event of our ports being opened, at less than from 50s. to 55s. a quarter.

Perhaps, however, we shall be able to draw a more accurate conclusion with respect to the *probable* future price of corn at Dantzic, from observing what it has actually been for the last fifty years. And, therefore, we beg to call the attention of our readers to the following Table furnished to the Committee of 1821, by Mr Grade of Dantzic, of the average prices of corn at that city, free on board, in decennial periods from 1770 to 1820.

*Average Price, from ten to ten years, of the different species of Corn, free on board, per quarter, in Sterling money, at Dantzic.*

	Wheat.		Rye.		Barley.		Oats.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
From 1770 to 1779 . .	33	9	21	8	16	1	11	1
1780 to 1789 . .	33	10	22	1	17	11	12	4
1790 to 1799 . .	43	8	26	3	19	3	12	6
1800 to 1809 . .	60	0	34	10	25	1	13	1
1810 to 1819 . .	55	4	31	1	26	0	20	4
Aggregate Average price of 49 Years }	45	4	27	2	20	10	13	10

Now, if to the average price of wheat at Dantzic during this period, we add 7s. or 8s. a quarter, on account of freight and insurance to London, and warehousing there, we shall have 52s. or 53s. a quarter, as its *minimum* cost in England during the same period.

But we shall be told, that whatever prices may have been at Dantzic five or ten years since, they are very different at present; and that the official returns made by the British Consul of the price of wheat in that city in 1824 and 1825, show that it did not exceed 21s. a quarter, or 24s. free on board. But while we admit the accuracy of this statement, we deny that it affords the shadow of a reason for doubting any of the conclusions we have been endeavouring to establish. It is true that, during the last two or three years, there has been, owing to the shutting up of the English and French ports, and the consequent cessation of a large proportion of the foreign demand, a great decline in the price of Polish wheat. We are not, however, to confound the accidentally low prices, caused by the occurrence of such circumstances, with their common and average level: For we may be assured, that if the present prices are below the sum for which corn can be raised for exportation in ordinary years, the depression cannot be permanent. There is no doctrine in economical science, or indeed in any science, better established than that which teaches, that production must cease when its expenses are no longer paid: And, though we have no very high idea of the penetration of the serfs of Poland and Russia, we apprehend they have sagacity enough to cease sending corn to market, when they find that the price they obtain for it is insufficient to remunerate them for their outlay. It is obvious, therefore, that the determination of the question with respect to the permanence of the present low prices, hinges upon the point, whether they are or are not sufficient to defray the expenses of the cultivators: If they *are*, we may expect to be able annually to buy from them about as much wheat as would furnish a single breakfast for the city of London for 24s. a quarter, exclusive of the expenses of carriage; but if they *are not*, we need not flatter ourselves with the expectation of getting so great an advantage.—Let us see how the fact stands.

To begin with native authorities:—Mr Grade of Dantzic states, in a letter printed in the Appendix to the Report of the Agricultural Committee of 1821 (p. 364), that ‘From a calculation made out by an eminent practical land proprietor in the adjoining province, it appears, that *if land could be had for nothing, and reckoning upon no casualties, such as a failure of the crop, extraordinary taxes, requisitions, quartering of troops, &c. the mere producing prices of grain would be—*

‘ 300 f.	Prussian currency per load of wheat,	or 31s. 9d. per quart.
‘ 150 f.	per do. of rye,	or 15s. 10d. per do.
‘ 120 f.	per do. of barley,	or 12s. 8d. per do.
‘ 90 f.	per do. of oats,	or 9s. 6d. per do.



‘ To these must be added, according to the distance and description of grain, from 4s. to 6s. a quarter for bringing the produce to market, and incidental expenses on the same.’ It will be observed, that this estimate applies only to the provinces in the vicinity of Dantzic. Had it applied to those south of Warsaw, the cost of bringing grain to market would have been at least double.

We have next to call the attention of our readers to the following extracts from a communication, addressed by Messrs Almonde and Behrend of Dantzic, to their correspondents in London, in October 1824. These gentlemen are largely engaged in the Dantzic corn trade. They have agents in every part of Poland; and are intimately acquainted with the state of the country. We ought also to observe, that Messrs Almonde and Behrend had no idea whatever that their communication was to be made public, and intended it merely for the private information of their friends in this country.

After giving an account of the quantity of grain warehoused at Dantzic, Koenigsberg, Elbing, and other ports on the Baltic, Messrs Almonde and Behrend proceed as follows:—

‘ The corn trade having now lingered in a depressed state for upwards of six years, the results of this unfortunate circumstance to the whole northern continent, and more particularly to this country, have been extremely disastrous. The penury of the agriculturists having been driven to the highest pitch, production has gradually diminished; and as the higher classes have also felt the pressure of this general impoverishment, our commercial intercourse with the Western parts of Europe has experienced a serious diminution. *It is generally thought that the consumption of British Colonial produce and manufactures does not, at present, exceed one half of what it was before this unfortunate crisis of the corn trade took place.*

‘ The price of wheat at which the Prussian farmer can afford to pay the moderate taxes of this country, is calculated, by the best economists, at about 35s. the Winchester quarter; but the landed proprietors in Volhynia, from which province we get the bulk of good wheat, *cannot supply the ports on the Baltic at less than 38s.*, as they have nearly 14s. a quarter to pay for freight, duties, and charges on account of the conveyance down the Vistula. Hence it appears, that our prices have, for these five years past, been *under the cost of production*; which accounts sufficiently for the considerable decrease which is observed in the extent of the Polish supplies and our home produce. It has been rumoured that our Government intends to retaliate, or at least to meet the present pro-

‘hibitive system of the western countries, by a similar measure, as regards several expensive articles of importation, which are not in the number of the immediate necessities of life; but little good is anticipated from such a measure, as it would perhaps tend to annihilate trade altogether.’

The information collected by Mr Jacob in his tour, corroborates in every respect the statements in this letter. He found that the quantity of grain in the warehouses at Dantzic, Elbing, &c. had been rapidly diminishing; and that the cultivators were gradually withdrawing land from tillage, and employing it in the feeding of sheep, the wool of which met with a comparatively advantageous sale. It appears, from the tables furnished to Mr Jacob, that the average price of wheat at Warsaw, from June 1796 to June 1820, had been 33s. a quarter, and in the ten years from 1815 to 1824, it had been 31s. But when Mr Jacob was there last year, the price was as low as 14s. 9d. ! In consequence of this extraordinary fall, the distress of the agriculturists had approached to a *maximum*. And Mr Jacob mentions, that he was assured by Count Mostoski, the minister of Finance, who has an estate near Warsaw, that the *cost price* of wheat in that neighbourhood was, at the very least, *twice as much* as it was then selling for—a statement which was confirmed by all the other individuals with whom he had any conversation on the subject; and which was indeed proved beyond all controversy, by the embarrassments in which the proprietors and cultivators were universally involved, and by the conversion of tillage land to pasture.—(*Report*, p. 38.)

It is thus established, by evidence which it seems impossible to controvert, that the present prices of corn in Poland are greatly under the cost of production, and that consequently, they must speedily rise. And assuming, as we are entitled to do, that 30s. a quarter is the lowest price for which any considerable quantity of wheat for exportation can be permanently raised in the corn growing provinces in the vicinity of Warsaw, its *minimum* cost price, when brought to London, according to the data furnished by Mr Jacob, would be as under.

	s.	d.
Cost of wheat at Warsaw per quarter,	30	0
Conveyance to the boats, and charges for loading and stowing, and securing it by mats	0	6
Freight to Dantzic	5	0
Loss on the passage by pilfering, and rain causing it to grow	3	0
Carry over,	38	6

	s.	d.
Brought over,	38	6
Expenses at Dantzic in turning, drying, screening and warehousing, and loss of measure	2	0
Profit or commission, as the case may be, to the merchant at Dantzic	1	6
Freight, primage, insurance, and shipping charges at Dantzic and in London	8	0
<i>Cost of the wheat to the English merchant</i>	50	0

It ought, however, to be observed, that the premium paid the underwriters does not cover the risk attending damage from heating or otherwise on the voyage; and it ought farther to be observed, that the freight from Warsaw to Dantzic, and from Dantzic home, is here charged at the lowest rate, or at the rate which is paid for the carriage of the trifling quantities that are at present exported. Mr Jacob supposes that a demand for as much wheat as would be equal to *six* days consumption of that grain in England, or for 216,000 quarters, would raise the cost of freightage on the Vistula from 30 to 40 per cent.: And as such a demand could not certainly be supplied without resorting to the markets in the provinces in the neighbourhood of Cracow, it is clear its *minimum cost* to the London merchants could not, under such circumstances, amount to less than from 52s. or 53s. to 55s. or 57s. a quarter.

We have dwelt so long on the circumstances connected with the Corn Trade of Poland, that we must be comparatively brief in our notices with respect to the state of that trade in other countries. Next to Dantzic, Hamburgh is perhaps the greatest corn market in the north of Europe, being at once a *dépôt*, as well for large quantities of Baltic corn, as for the produce of the countries traversed by the Elbe. But the excess of wheat exported from Hamburgh over that which is imported, is much less than might have been expected, and amounts, on an average of the last ten years, to only 48,263 quarters a year. The average price of wheat at Hamburgh, during the six years ending with 1822, was 47s. 4d. a quarter. Bohemian wheat is occasionally forwarded by the river to Hamburgh; but the charges attending its conveyance from Prague amount to full 17s. a quarter, and effectually prevent its being sent down, except when the price is excessively high.

Mr Jacob mentions, that the quantity of wheat exported from Denmark in the six months which followed the abundant harvest of 1824, amounted to only 57,561 quarters; and he doubts whether there were 20,000 quarters in store in that kingdom

last October. (*Report*, p. 10.) Undoubtedly, however, a greater quantity of grain would be obtained from Denmark were our ports constantly open. And perhaps we might be able, did our prices average from 50s. to 55s., to import in ordinary years from 180,000 to 200,000 quarters of wheat from Denmark, and the countries intersected by the Weser and the Elbe.

Amsterdam is merely a depôt for foreign corn: a very small part only of its consumption is supplied from corn of the growth of Holland, so that prices there are entirely dependent upon the prices at Dantzic and the other great Northern markets.

It appears, from the accounts given by the Marquis Garnier in the last edition of his translation of the 'Wealth of Nations,' that the price of the *hectolitre* of wheat at the market of Paris, amounted, on an average of the nineteen years beginning with 1801, and ending with 1819, to 20 fr. 53 cent.; which is equal to 30 fr. 80 cent. the septier, or taking the exchange at 25 fr. to 45s. 6d. the quarter. Count Chaptal, in his valuable work, *Sur l'Industrie Française*, (tom. 1. p. 226), published in 1819, estimates the ordinary average price of wheat throughout France at 18 fr. the hectolitre, or 42s. 10d. the quarter. The various expenses attending the importation of a quarter of French wheat into London may be taken, at a medium, at about 7s. a quarter. France, however, has very little surplus produce to dispose of; so that it would be impossible for us to import any considerable quantity of French corn without occasioning a great advance of price.

We regret that we are possessed of but few authentic details with respect to the state of the corn trade at Odessa on the Black Sea, the only port in Southern Europe from which any considerable quantity of grain is exported. We believe, however, that the fertility of the land in the vicinity of Odessa has been most grossly exaggerated; and, owing to the difficulty of the navigation down the Dniester, corn from the Polish provinces to the south of Cracow, has to be conveyed to Odessa, at an immense expense, in waggons! According to the returns made by the British Consul, the average price of hard wheat at Odessa last year, when there was very little foreign demand, amounted to about 20s. a quarter; and, according to a statement given in a late number of the *Westminster Review*, said to have been obtained from the best mercantile authority in Odessa, the average price of both hard and soft wheat in that market, for the eight years ending with 1824, amounted to 22s. 4½d. Owing to the distance of Odessa, and the difficulty of navigat-

ing the Black Sea, the charges on account of the importation of wheat from thence to London are rated as high as 22s. 6d. a quarter. It appears, therefore, that the lowest cost price of Odessa wheat, in the English market, would amount to about 45s.; but the *quality* of average Odessa wheat being fully *one-sixth* inferior to the quality of average English wheat, it could not, it is plain, be sold in ordinary years in the London market except when the average price of English wheat was equal to or above 53s. or 54s. a quarter.

It appears, from the consular returns, that the prices of wheat last year at New York and Philadelphia may be taken, on an average, at from 34s. to 35s. a quarter. But they were then unusually low; and as the cost of importing a quarter of wheat from the United States into England, amounts to from 12s. to 14s., it is seen that no considerable supply could be obtained from that quarter, were our prices under 50s. or 52s. a quarter. The usual price of wheat in Canada, when there is a demand for the English market, is about 40s. a quarter; but taking it as low as 35s., if we add to this 12s. a quarter as the expenses of carriage, it will make its cost price in Liverpool 47s.; and being spring wheat, it is not so valuable by about 6s. a quarter as English wheat.

We think that, by this investigation, we have completely established two most important points. *First*, that the total quantity of all sorts of grain imported into Great Britain and Ireland, in the event of our ports being thrown open, could hardly, under any almost conceivable circumstances, exceed from *one-twentieth* to *one-twelfth* part of our entire consumption; and, *second*, that the price for which such foreign corn could be obtained, could not, in ordinary years, be less than 50s. a quarter; and would most probably range from 52s. to 57s.

Now, it appears from the official accounts laid before the House of Commons, that the average price of wheat in England and Wales, for the *ten* years ending with 1825, amounted to 66s. 11d. a quarter; and, lest we should be accused of overstating the ordinary importation price of foreign wheat, we shall estimate it at the low rate of only 48s.; and shall suppose, that though it were burdened, as we shall subsequently endeavour to show it ought to be, with a duty of 5s. or 6s. a quarter, it might, notwithstanding, be sold on an average for 53s. or 54s. And even on this most reasonable hypothesis, it is evident, in the event of the ports being thrown open, under the above mentioned duty, that there is no reason whatever to suppose that prices would be reduced more than from 13s. to 14s. a quarter below the average of the last *ten* years, including of

course the high-priced years of 1817 and 1818, or more than 8s. or 9s. a quarter below the average prices of the last eight years.

We feel pretty confident that the statements we have now made cannot be controverted; and they show, conclusively, how miserable an error it is to suppose that the repeal of the existing Corn laws, and the opening of the ports for importation, under a duty of 5s. or 6s., could have the effect of throwing a large proportion of our cultivated lands into pasture, or causing a ruinous decline in the price of corn. The average price of wheat in England and Wales in 1802, 1803, and 1804, years of decided agricultural improvement, was exactly 61s. a quarter, being only 7s. or 8s. above its probable future average price under a system of free trade; while the greater cheapness of labour, and the various improvements that have been made in agriculture since 1804, would enable corn to be raised from the same soils at a much less expense at this moment than in that year. It cannot be justly said that even 1823 was by any means an unfavourable year for the farmers; and yet the average price of wheat was then only 51s. 9d., being 1s. 3d. a quarter *less* than its lowest possible average price under the system we have ventured to propose. The landlords and farmers may, therefore, take courage. Their prosperity does not rest on the basis of an odious restrictive regulation; but is the effect of the fertility of the soil which belongs to them, of the absence of all oppressive feudal privileges, and of the number and wealth of the consumers of their produce. The unbounded freedom of the corn trade would not render it necessary to abandon any but the most worthless soils, which ought never to have been broken up; and would, consequently, have but a very slight effect on rent.

But while the abolition of the Corn laws would be productive of no material injury to the farmers and landlords, by reducing the average price of raw produce, it would, by giving greater steadiness to prices, be no less advantageous to them than to the other classes of the community. Were the freedom of the corn trade established, our prices would be governed by the *average* price of Europe: And it is plain, inasmuch as the weather that is unfavourable to the crops raised in a district having a particular soil or climate, is most commonly favourable to those raised in districts having a different soil or climate, that the *average* price of a great Continent, or rather of the whole Commercial world, must necessarily be incomparably more steady than that of a single kingdom. It is observed by Mr Gibbon, that ‘those famines which so frequently afflicted the infant Republic, were seldom or never ex-

‘perienced by the extensive empire of Rome. *The accidental scarcity of any single province, was immediately relieved by the plenty of its more fortunate neighbour.*’ (Decline and Fall, I. p. 86.) Holland, during the days of her greatest prosperity, was chiefly fed on imported corn; and it is an undoubted fact, that prices in Amsterdam were always comparatively moderate, and fluctuated less than in any other market of Europe.\* The experience, in a word, of all ages and nations proves, beyond all question, that it is freedom, and freedom only, that can put an effectual stop to those sudden and excessive fluctuations in the price of corn which are so extremely ruinous to all classes of the community, but most of all to the farmer. When a comparatively rich and highly populous country like England excludes foreign produce from her markets, she is compelled to resort to very inferior soils for supplies of food. In consequence, her average prices are raised far above the common level of surrounding countries; and therefore, when an unusually luxuriant crop occurs, no relief being obtained from exportation, the whole surplus produce is thrown on her own markets, and a ruinous depression of price necessarily and unavoidably follows. The avowed object of the Corn law of 1815, which prevented all importation of foreign wheat for home consumption until the home price rose to 80s., was to keep the price steadily up to that level. But the slightest acquaintance with the most obvious principles, would have taught the framers of this Act that it could never attain that object. By preventing importation, except in years when the home crops are deficient, we necessarily prevent the establishment of any regular and systematic intercourse with foreign countries. Since 1815, no Polish or American cultivator has ever been able to calculate on a demand from England: In consequence, no corn has been raised in these countries for our markets; and when our crops have been deficient, the inadequacy of the foreign supplies has allow-

---

\* ‘*Que la disette des grains,*’ (says M. Luzac, the well-informed author of the *Richesse de la Hollande*), ‘*regne dans les quatre parties du monde; vous trouverez du froment, du seigle, et d’autres grains à Amsterdam; ils n’y manquent jamais.*’ An attempt has recently been made to controvert the principle stated above, by referring to the variations that have taken place in the price of wheat at Amsterdam during the last ten or twelve years. But these variations are almost wholly owing to our corn laws. Whenever our ports are opened, the prices in the markets in the vicinity suddenly rise to nearly our level; and when they are shut, they as suddenly decline. Our system is not only a nuisance to ourselves, but to all our neighbours.

ed our prices to rise to an exorbitant height. Had the corn trade been free, the calamitous harvest of 1816, for example, would have been met by abundant importations, the average price in April that year being 65s. 5d.; but it was not ascertained that the ports would open at 80s. till the 15th of November, *when the season was too far advanced to admit of importation from the great corn ports of Europe*; and in consequence, before the spring shipments could arrive, the average price of wheat had risen to 103s. 11d., being little short of double its price only twelve months before! Owing partly to the unprecedented destruction of agricultural capital that had taken place during the low prices of 1814, 1815, and 1816, partly to deficient harvests, and, more than all, to the restraints on importation, the prices of 1817, 1818 and 1819, were oppressively high. But mark the effects of this increase of price. It led the farmers to suppose that the Corn law was at length beginning to have the effects its supporters had anticipated from it; their drooping spirits were in consequence revived; fresh capital was applied to the land; and this increase of tillage, conspiring with favourable seasons, again sunk prices to such a degree, that they fell in October 1822 so low as 38s. 1d., the average of that year being only 43s. 3d.!

It is thus that the restrictive system is productive of double mischief. By preventing importation, it aggravates all the evils of scarcity when the home crops are deficient; while, by forcing the cultivation of poor soils, and raising average prices, it prevents exportation in a year of unusual plenty, and renders the bounty of Providence a curse to the farmer! So long as we support the existing Corn laws, we shall have the same incessant alternation of ruinously low and oppressively high prices which we have experienced since 1815. At one time our ears will be stunned with the complaints of the agriculturists; and when these have subsided, they will be assailed with the louder and more piercing and menacing cries of the manufacturing population—with the noise of radical rebellions, and fresh suspensions of the Habeas Corpus Act! The low prices of the restrictive system cannot be otherwise then ephemeral—*opulentia mox paritura egestatem*;—for these low prices, by destroying agricultural capital, and driving bad land out of cultivation, necessarily diminish the supply, and occasion an unmeasured increase of price on the occurrence of the first unfavourable harvest. But it is material to observe, that while this increase of price is fatal to the great mass of the consumers, it is of no real advantage to the agriculturists; for, by attracting additional capital to the soil, and extending cultivation, the supply is again increased; and, instead of their extravagant expectations being



realized, the first luxuriant harvest again plunges them into the abyss of poverty and misery! Such is the practical and real operation of this monstrous system. Alternately productive of famine and excess, it is equally ruinous to the agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial classes; and, if not put down, it will most probably end by destroying the capital of the country, and by sinking all classes, high as well as low, below the level of what was originally lowest.\*

\* The corn law of 1822 is a second, though certainly not an improved, edition of that of 1815. It allows the importation of foreign wheat when the home price is 70s.; but if the home price is under 80s., a duty of 17s. is imposed during the first three months, and of 12s. afterwards! This is really very near the same thing as absolute exclusion up to 80s. This law has not hitherto come into operation, except in the case of oats. We subjoin a note of the provisions of this Act, and of the provisions in the two Acts passed during the last Sessions, for allowing foreign corn to be taken out of warehouse for home consumption; and for giving a power to the Privy Council to admit foreign corn until six weeks after the meeting of Parliament, under certain modifications.

By the 3d of Geo. IV., cap. 60, the Act of 1815 was repealed, and importation was permitted, when, for three months preceding the 15th of February, May, August, or November, the average prices exceeded the rates stated below, at the rates of duty affixed, viz.

When the average prices rate as below.

When the average prices rate as below.							Extra for the first 3 Months.		
Description of GRAIN.	From British Possessions in AMERICA.			From all other parts.		Rate of DUTY p. Quar.			
WHEAT	If at 59s.	Per	but	67s.	If at 70s.	but	80s.	12s.	5s.
	.. 67s.	Quarter	under	71s.	.. 80s.	under	85s.	5s.	5s.
			If at or above	71s.		or if at or above	85s.	1s.	
BEANS, Peas or Rye	if at 39s.	Per	but	41s.	if at 44s.	but	53s.	8s.	3s. 6d.
	.. 44s.	Quarter	under	46s.	.. 53s.	under	55s.	3s. 6d.	3s. 6d.
			If at or above	46s.		or if at or above	55s.	8d.	
BARLEY, Bear or Hogg	if at 30s.	Per	but	33s.	if at 33s.	but	40s.	6s.	2s. 6d.
	.. 33s.	Quarter	under	35s. 6d.	.. 40s.	under	42s. 6d.	2s. 6d.	2s. 6d.
			If at or above	35s.		or if at or above	42s. 6d.	6d.	
OATS	if at 20s.	Per	but	22s. 6d.	if at 25s.	but	28s.	4s.	2s.
	.. 22s. 6d.	Quarter	under	24s.	.. 28s.	under	30s.	3s.	2s.
			If at or above	24s.		or if at or above	30s.	4d.	
Wheat Meal or Flour, and Oatmeal, are admitted for Consumption, either from British Possessions in America or from any other part, at the rates of duty hereunto affixed, when the average prices of Wheat and Oats respectively correspond with the Rates above specified.—Peas, when prohibited as corn, are admitted for seed or any other purpose at 7s. per Bushel.					Wheat Meal		3s. 3d.	1s. 7d.	
					or FLOUR.		1s. 7d.	1s. 7d.	
					at per Cwt.		4d.		
					OATMEAL		4s. 10d.	2s. 2d.	
					per Boll.		2s. 2d.	2s. 2d.	
							6d.		

Attempts have frequently been made to form a pecuniary estimate of the actual loss which the existing restrictions on the corn trade entail on the country in ordinary years. But it is evident that the whole mischief to which they give rise, and their disastrous influence upon the public tranquillity, do not admit of being measured by a pecuniary standard. We think, however, that we may assume, as a point fully established by the previous investigation, that in the event of

---

By 7 Geo. IV. cap. 70. Foreign Corn, Meal, and Flour warehoused, were permitted to be taken out for Home Consumption, until the 16th day of August 1826.

*At the following rates of duty, viz.*

Wheat - - -	12s. per quarter.	Barley, Bear, or Big 6s. per quarter.
Beans, Peas or Rye	8s. — do.	Oats - - - - 4s. do.

*Wheat Meal or Flour 3s. 3d. per Cwt.*

7 Geo. IV. cap. 71. An Act to empower his Majesty to admit Foreign Corn for Home Consumption, under certain limitations, until the 1st of January 1827, or for 6 Weeks after the Commencement of the next ensuing Session of Parliament, if Parliament shall not then be Sitting. The following is the detail, viz.

‘Whereas it may become expedient, for a time to be limited, to admit a further quantity of corn or flour for home consumption, in addition to the foreign corn, grain, meal, or flour, which had been warehoused, or reported inwards to be warehoused, on or before the 2d day of May 1826: Be it therefore enacted, by the King’s Most Excellent Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, that at any time after the end of the present Session of Parliament, and until the 1st day of January 1827, or for six weeks after the commencement of the then ensuing Session of Parliament, if Parliament shall not then be sitting, it shall be lawful for his Majesty, by any order or orders to be by him issued, by and with the advice of his Privy Council, to admit to entry for home consumption any quantity of warehoused wheat or wheat flour not exceeding 500,000 quarters in the whole, on payment of such duty as shall be declared in any such order to be payable upon the entry of the same: Provided always, that no such order in Council shall continue in force for more than two calendar months from the day of the date thereof; and provided also, that no such order shall extend to admit to entry any wheat or wheat flour which had been warehoused, or reported inwards to be warehoused, before the said second of May.

‘Provided always, That the duty so to be declared in any such order shall not in any case exceed the duty enacted by 3 Geo. IV., cap. 60.’

The fact of such acts as those now quoted having been passed, sets the impolicy of the existing system, and the necessity of its abo-

the ports being thrown open to the free importation of wheat charged with a duty of 5s. or 6s., we should not only be exempted from those ruinous fluctuations of price that are inherent in the restrictive system, but that the average price of wheat would not in ordinary years exceed 53s., and other grain in proportion. Now, it is an incontrovertible proposition, that every additional shilling added to the price of the FORTY-EIGHT millions of quarters consumed in the Empire, by means of the

lition, in the clearest point of view. It is difficult at this moment (10th September), to collect any precise information with respect to the productiveness of the harvest that has just been concluded. We do not think, however, that there can be any doubt that oats and barley, and probably also potatoes, will be very deficient: And if so, it is clear that a large proportion of the poorer classes will be involved in great distress, although the wheat crop is understood to be rather above an average. Had it not been for the restrictions on importation, we should now have been importing oats from all quarters.

We subjoin, for the convenience of our readers, an account of the average prices of the principal species of grain in Great Britain, from 1800 to 1825, abstracted from the Parliamentary Paper, No. 227, Sess. 1824-5.

Years.	Wheat, average price per Quarter.		Barley, average price per Quarter.		Rye, average price per Quarter.		Oats, average price per Quarter.		Peas, average price per Quarter.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
1800	110	5	72	3	76	11	43	7	67	5
1801	115	11	61	6	79	9	35	11	67	8
1802	67	9	32	4	43	3	19	9	39	6
1803	57	1	24	7	36	11	20	11	38	6
1804	60	5	30	1	37	1	23	7	40	10
1805	87	1	43	2	54	4	27	6	48	4
1806	76	9	37	6	47	4	26	9	43	6
1807	73	1	38	2	47	6	27	6	55	11
1808	78	11	42	1	52	4	32	4	66	7
1809	94	5	45	7	60	9	30	6	60	2
1810	103	3	46	8	59	0	27	9	55	9
1811	92	5	41	0	49	11	26	9	51	6
1812	122	8	64	9	75	11	43	2	73	7
1813	106	6	56	9	70	7	37	4	78	6
1814	72	11	36	3	44	6	24	11	50	0
1815	63	8	29	4	37	10	22	11	38	10
1816	76	2	32	11	43	2	22	6	38	4
1817	94	0	47	11	56	6	31	6	51	5
1818	83	8	52	3	54	10	31	6	59	11
1819	72	3	44	5	49	0	27	4	56	0
1820	65	10	32	10	40	10	23	6	44	11
1821	54	5	25	3	31	1	18	11	31	9
1822	43	3	21	3	20	3	17	7	25	7
1823	51	9	30	7	30	11	22	3	33	11
1824	62	0	35	3	40	2	24	1	39	5
1825	66	6								

prohibition against importation, is really equivalent, in its effects on the consumer, *to a tax of 2,400,000*l.* laid directly on corn*: And estimating the difference between the average price of all sorts of grain for the last eight or ten years, and its average price were the ports thrown open, at 8*s.* a quarter, *this would make a total aggregate loss to the consumer, of not less than NINETEEN MILLIONS SEVEN HUNDRED THOUSAND POUNDS STERLING a year!*

It is of the greatest importance to mark the dilemma in which the advocates of agricultural monopoly are placed by this statement. If, on the one hand, they say that we *have understated* the price at which foreign corn could be imported, and that we should not really be able to obtain it, with a duty of 5*s.* or 6*s.* a quarter, for less than 60*s.* or 65*s.*, then it is plain their present monopoly can be of scarcely any value to the agriculturists; \* and that its only effect is to shut us out from participating in the provision made by nature for equalizing the variations in the harvests of particular countries by means of commerce, and consequently to occasion those destructive oscillations of price, which are at least as ruinous to the farmer as to either the manufacturer or merchant: And if, on the other hand, the advocates of monopoly should accuse us of having *overstated*, as we suspect will be the case, the price at which foreign corn could be imported—if prices, for example, instead of declining 8*s.* after the ports were thrown open, would decline 10*s.* a quarter; then it is clear that the Corn laws must be a much greater nuisance than we take them for, and that, instead of occasioning a loss of 19,700,000*l.* to the consumers, they must really occasion a loss of 24,000,000*l.*: and if the price of corn should, on an average, decline 15*s.* a quarter, it follows that the annual loss occasioned by the Corn laws to the consumers cannot amount to less than the enormous sum of THIRTY-SIX MILLIONS!

But believing, for the reasons already stated, that the loss really sustained by the consumers of corn, in consequence of the restrictions on importation raising its average price 8*s.* a quarter above what it would be were they abolished, may be fairly and moderately estimated at about *twenty* millions, it is of the utmost importance to inquire what becomes of this immense sum.

The common opinion is, that the whole of it goes to swell the rent-roll of the landlords: But this is an obvious mistake. It

---

\* The average price of wheat for the *six* years ending with 1825, in Great Britain, was as low as 57*s.* 3*d.* a quarter.

is doubtful, in fact, whether the entire rental of England and Wales amounts at this moment to *twenty-four* millions. The truth is, that the monopoly created by the Corn laws is not like any other monopoly. It does not occasion a mere transfer of wealth from one portion of the community, who are its rightful owners, to another portion, who have no just claim to it. If the monopoly enjoyed by the landlords and corn-growers were like that enjoyed by the East India Company—if its effect was only to occasion an unnatural distribution of the wealth of the country—to plunder and impoverish nine-tenths of the population to enrich the other tenth, it would be comparatively harmless. But it is of the very essence of this question to observe, that the corn laws occasion the *destruction* of much more wealth than they *transfer*. We do not exaggerate when we affirm, that of every *five hundred thousand pounds* of excess of price drawn from the pockets of the consumers, scarcely *one hundred thousand* finds its way into the pockets of the landlords! The other *four hundred thousand* are absolutely and totally lost to the country; they are expended *en pure perte*, and without contributing in the smallest degree to increase the comforts or enjoyments of any individual whatever. We admit that this is rather a startling statement; but if we succeed in establishing its perfect accuracy, it cannot be necessary to add another word to show the vast advantages that would result from the abolition of the Corn laws.

The rent of a country consists as we have shown again and again, of the excess, or the value of the excess, of the produce obtained from the superior soils under cultivation, above that which is obtained from the worst. But when, by excluding ourselves from the cheapest markets for corn, we force recourse to be had to poorer soils, we not only increase the *magnitude* and *value* of that portion of the produce of the country received by the landlord as rent, but we also increase the value of that portion which is required to indemnify the farmer for his expenses,—a portion which is invariably much larger than the other. According to answers made to queries circulated by the Board of Agriculture, and the evidence taken before the Committees of the Houses of Lords and Commons in 1814 and 1821, the average proportion which the rent paid to the landlords in England and Wales, bears to the whole produce of the soil, does not exceed A FIFTH. But let us take the proportion as high as A FOURTH: it is plain, that, when prices rise because of restrictions on importation from abroad, or any other cause, the landlords receive such additional price only for that *one fourth* part of the produce of the

country which belongs to them as rent. This is a point about which it is evidently impossible there can be two opinions. And it is hardly less obvious, that neither the farmer nor any other individual reaps the smallest advantage from the rise in the price or value of the *three-fourths*, which do not go to the landlord. For, it must be observed, that when the price of corn rises, the wages of the labourers which the farmer employs, must sooner or later be raised in a corresponding proportion; at the same time that the expenses of seed, of the keep of horses, of the maintenance of his own family, &c., are all *equally and immediately increased*. If the rise of price, occasioned by the exclusion of foreign corn, could be confined to that portion of the produce which belongs to the landlord, he would receive the whole extra sum forced by the exclusion out of the pockets of the consumer. But this is not, and cannot possibly be the case. There cannot be *two* prices of the same commodity at the same time and in the same market. The monopoly system, which gives a greater value to that *one-fourth* part of the produce of the country which goes to the landlords as rent, equally raises the value of the other *three-fourths*, which are partly cast into the soil as seed, and partly consumed by the men, horses, and oxen employed by the farmer.

It appears, therefore, from reasonings directly deduced from the statements of the most intelligent agriculturists, that to whatever extent the Corn laws raise the price of corn above what it would be were these laws repealed, not more than *one-fourth* part of that sum finds its way into the pockets of the landlords; and that the remaining *three-fourths* are absolutely and entirely lost or destroyed. It has been contended, indeed, that although a very large proportion of that increased price, which the present system obliges the consumers of corn to pay for it, is not received either by the landlord or farmer, it is paid as wages to the labourers employed in its production, and cannot, therefore, be said to be wholly lost. But this is plainly a most feeble and impotent attempt to bolster up a worthless system, by still more worthless arguments. We ask, first, whether it is possible to deny that the increased value which the restrictive system gives to the corn used as seed, and in the feeding of horses, is not absolutely and totally lost? Can it be said that seed is more productive when it costs 70s. or 80s. a quarter, than when it costs only 50s. or 55s.? Or, is it really true, that the strength and swiftness of our horses are augmented when they are made to feed on dearer corn? But, even if all the produce which is not received by the landlord were to be expended in the maintenance of labourers, it would be of no consequence to our argument. It is

true, that if we were to purchase our food in the cheapest market, a considerable number of persons now engaged in the cultivation of bad soils would be thrown out of *that* employment. But it is no less true that they would be employed in some other way. If the consumers of corn were able to obtain the same supply of that necessary for two-thirds or three-fourths of the sum which it now costs, they would most unquestionably have the other third or fourth of this sum to expend on something else. The *total effective* demand of the country for the produce of labour, and consequently the rate of wages, and the power of obtaining employment, would therefore continue the same; while its wealth would be augmented by the produce of the labour of all the hands which had been set free from the production of corn. Suppose we require, under the existing system, the labour of *two* millions of people to raise forty-eight millions of quarters of corn, and that, by throwing the ports open, we obtain as large a supply by the labour of *one million and a half*; then, as the means by which the consumers paid the labour of the two millions of hands could not be diminished in consequence of this increased facility of production, it is clear to demonstration, that, after the fall of prices, the surplus half million of hands would be employed in some other pursuit; and consequently, that the produce of their labour would be so much *clear gain*—so much of *positive addition* to the previous wealth and riches of the country.

It may therefore be concluded, that of the enormous sum of about *TWENTY* millions, which the restrictions on the corn trade take, in ordinary years, from the consumers, not more than *five* find their way into the pockets of the landlords. The other *fifteen* millions are entirely lost, or, which is the same thing, are entirely swallowed up by the increased expenses attending the cultivation of the bad soils to which the Corn laws force us to have recourse. Instead, then, of its being true, as has sometimes been alleged, that the Corn laws assist in enabling the country to make good the taxes necessary to pay the interest of the public debt, and the expenses of the peace establishment, it is obvious that *they form, of themselves, by far the greatest of all the burdens we have to sustain!* No people was ever before subjected to such a scourge. The Corn laws do not, like an ordinary tax, transfer wealth from one portion of the public to another; but, on the most moderate estimate, they occasion a positive destruction—*a dead annual loss to the public of not less than FOURTEEN or FIFTEEN millions!*

Bad, however, as this must certainly appear, it is not perhaps the most unfavourable view of the operation and practical ef-

fect of the Corn laws. When the rate of wages is raised, in consequence of a rise in the price of raw produce, *the rate of profit is universally reduced*. The incomes of the capitalists being thus diminished, their means of amassing additional capital and employing fresh labourers are proportionally reduced, at the same time that an overwhelming temptation is created to transfer capital to other countries where profits are higher. There can be no manner of doubt that a large proportion of the loans lately made in this country to the Continental States and the South American Republics, must be ascribed to this principle, or to the operation of the Corn laws in depressing profits: and the bankruptcy and ruin that have been occasioned by these loans, and the injury done to the working classes by sending abroad so large an amount of capital, or of the funds destined for the employment of labour, are of themselves conclusive reasons why the Corn Laws should be abolished.

Although, therefore, it were true that the landlords really made the sum of four or five millions a year by the existing Corn laws, we cannot but think that they would rather consent to relinquish it, than continue to cling to a system fraught with so much injustice and ruin. But instead of gaining by it, we are most firmly persuaded that this system is no less hostile to their *real and lasting interests* than to those of the rest of the community. *Provided prices could be kept steady*, they would certainly gain for a while the advantage we have supposed. But this is plainly an impossible condition: Prices can never be steady under this system; and we are quite sure, that every landlord who will dispassionately consider the subject must admit, that it would be more for his interest to be secured in the regular payment of a somewhat lower average amount of rent, than to be perpetually exposed, as he must be during the continuance of the restrictive system, to the non-payment of the high rents that may be promised him in high-priced years. It is, moreover, in every point of view, the extreme of folly to suppose, that a system, which is so essentially injurious to the other classes of the community, can be really beneficial to those who have so deep an interest in the public prosperity as the landlords. Whatever advantage they may derive from it, can only be fleeting and illusory: for it must of necessity be purchased at the expense of those with whom their own interests are inseparably and indissolubly connected. If prices were steady, the landlord's rents would also be steady. His estate would not be ruined by over-cropping, and by the breaking up of old grass land and meadows in high priced years; nor would it be thrown on his hands without the possi-



bility of letting it, when prices sink below the cost of production.\* Instead of being deluded by expectations of augmented revenue, which, so long as the present system lasts, can never be realized for four years in succession, he would be able to form a precise notion of the extent of his income and resources, and would be able to proportion his expenditure to his means; and above all, he would have the pleasing consciousness that he had regained his proper place in society and in the public estimation; that he was no longer regarded as a monopolist, and that his interests, instead of being opposed, as is at present the case, to those of his neighbours, were identified with theirs.

But it is a mistake to suppose that the abolition of the restrictions on importation would be merely innoxious to the landlords. The truth is, that it would be greatly and signally beneficial to them. Not only would the landlords gain by the general improvement that would infallibly result from the freedom of the corn trade, but they would also be relieved from a burden, which, at this moment, presses heavily on their estates, and threatens, at no distant period, to absorb the whole of their rents. It is almost unnecessary to say, that we allude to the Poor-rates. Were it not for the extreme variations in the price of corn, the payments to able-bodied labourers, which constitute full three-fourths of the total assessment, might be entirely dispensed with. But so long as we continue to act on a system, which necessarily occasions the most tremendous fluctuations of price, it is quite visionary to think of getting rid of this burden. Wages, though they are ultimately regulated by the price of necessaries, do not vary immediately with their variations. Prices, and consequently wages, are reduced by a *succession* of abundant harvests; but wages do not, and cannot rise the moment the harvest becomes deficient, and prices attain the famine level. And if, under such circumstances, the labourers of a densely peopled country like England, where their condition can never be very prosperous, were not partly provided for by extrinsic assistance, the probability, or rather, we should say, the certainty, is, that rebellion and intestine commotion would ensue, and that the security of property would be completely subverted.

---

\* We are acquainted with a very fine farm in the South of Scotland that was let in 1811 for 735*l.* a year. It was over-cropped; and, on being relet for three years in 1816, it only brought 59*l.* a year! Innumerable instances of a similar description might be pointed out. And notwithstanding all that has been said and written to the contrary, we are most decidedly of opinion, that it is something worse than absurd to suppose that a system productive of such results can be beneficial to the landlords.

Those, therefore, who are really desirous of freeing the country from the great and constantly increasing burden of poor-rates, ought above all to direct their efforts to procure the abolition of those restrictions which, by causing excessive fluctuations in the price of necessaries, expose the poor to misery and famine, and disable them for providing for themselves. Abolish the Corn laws, and the abolition of all rates levied on account of the able-bodied poor may be carried with equal facility and security. But if the landlords will not consent to the establishment of a system of freedom, let them not deceive themselves by supposing that the pressure of the poor-rates will ever be effectually diminished. If they will have monopoly, they must take all its consequences along with it; and they must neither murmur nor repine, should every shilling of their rents be ultimately required for the support of workhouses and beggars.

There is another circumstance which has not been noticed in the recent discussions with respect to the Corn laws, but which seems to us to be of the greatest importance in forming a right estimate of their operation—we mean the stimulus given by a high price of corn to the cultivation of potatoes. When there are two species of food obtainable in a country, it is obvious that an artificial rise in the price of the one, has really the same effect on the other as if a *bounty* were given on its consumption. We have been endeavouring to collect authentic accounts with respect to the cultivation of potatoes in Great Britain since 1795; and these, though imperfect, are sufficient to show that it has been at least *tripled* during the period in question. We have also been assured by those who have had the best means of forming a correct opinion on such a point, that the comparatively low range of prices since 1820, is to be in a very considerable degree ascribed to the increased consumption of potatoes. They have already become a more important article than corn in the subsistence of the labouring class in many very populous districts; and were a succession of bad harvests and high prices to take place for four or five years together, the stimulus they would give to the use of the potato would be so great, that it is doubtful whether our prices would not be, in consequence, permanently sunk below the level of those of the Continent. Surely, however, it cannot be necessary for us to say that these results cannot be too much deprecated. Should our people ever become habitually dependent upon the potato for the principal part of their food, they would unavoidably sink to the same miserable condition as the peasantry of Ireland. Under such circumstances, their wages being entirely regulated

by the price of the cheapest species of food hitherto raised in Europe, would not enable them to obtain any thing else, when it was deficient; so that, whenever the potato crop failed, they would be left without the means of support; and dearth would be attended with all the horrors of famine!

For these reasons we hold it to be clear, that though foreign corn were for ever excluded from our markets, and though it were possible to prevent them from being overstocked with corn of our own growth, the stimulus that increased prices would give to the growth and consumption of potatoes would effectually prevent them from being maintained, for any considerable period, at a high elevation. We entreat the public to advert to this circumstance; and we feel confident that every landlord who does so, will agree with us in thinking, that it is *of itself* sufficient to show, that in attempting to keep up prices to an unnatural height, the agriculturists have engaged in an enterprise in which they *cannot but fail*; and which must, under any conceivable circumstances, be productive alike of the most serious injury to themselves and their country.

The farmers have still less reason than the landlords to support the existing system; and it is indeed quite apparent, that if they had a clear perception of their own interest, they would join in petitioning for its abolition. Suppose it were possible to maintain the home prices steady at about 80s., still it is easy to see, that it would be infinitely better for the farmers were they to be allowed to settle at the fair and natural level of 50s. or 55s. If prices become stationary at the lower limit of 50s. or 55s., the rent, wages of labour, and other outgoings of the farmer, will all be proportionally adjusted; if they are raised to the higher limit of 80s., rent, wages, &c. will sustain a corresponding increase. It is impossible, however, as it has been repeatedly demonstrated, to raise wages without *reducing profits*; so that it is unquestionably true, that instead of high prices being really advantageous to the farmer, they are distinctly and completely the reverse. The object of the farmer, as of all other producers, must always be to derive the greatest possible profit from his capital; and it is absolutely certain that profits invariably fall as prices rise, and rise as prices fall. The price of wheat in Illinois and Indiana does not amount to one-third of its price in England; and yet an Illinois or Indiana farmer, with a capital of 1000*l.*, would derive as much profit from it as an English farmer would derive from a capital of 3000*l.* or 4000*l.* It appears, therefore, that the real and permanent interests of the farmers and consumers are precisely the same; and that a permanently high price of produce, supposing it

could be maintained, would not be less injurious to the one class than the other.

‘A farmer,’ it has been justly said, ‘is as much a capitalist as a shopkeeper, or a manufacturer, and the profits of farming capital must, in the end, be lowered by any cause which lowers the profits of other capital. It is the interest of all capitalists to have the necessaries of life, and consequently corn among the rest, cheap; because their labourers will then be contented with lower wages. A farmer’s gain cannot be permanently greater than that of other capitalists. Even during the currency of a lease, a rise in the price of corn is not always an advantage to him; for, if there be a general rise in the price of all other commodities also at the same time, he must give a corresponding increased price for his coats, hats, horses, sheep, cattle, &c.; and, unless during the currency of a lease, he has no interest whatever in high prices; because competition will effectually prevent him from deriving more than a very temporary advantage from them. He has, however, in common with all other capitalists, a very strong interest in high profits; and it is not possible that profits should be high for a long period together, when the necessaries of life are dear. A high price of corn, therefore, not only is not beneficial to the farmer as such, but it is positively injurious to him. He is injured in two ways; first, as a consumer of corn in common with the rest of the community, by having to consume a dear instead of a cheap commodity; and, secondly, he is injured in a still greater degree, as an owner of capital, by being compelled to give high wages to all the labourers he employs.’ \*

We should never have done were we to attempt to recapitulate the various arguments that might be produced to show that the abolition of the Corn laws would be equally advantageous to the landlords and farmers as to the other classes. It is unnecessary, however, to dwell at any greater length on this part of our subject, the arguments we have already brought forward being more than sufficient to establish this identity of interests. But suppose that we are wrong in this conclusion, and that the landlords and farmers would really suffer considerable injury from the abolition of the Corn laws, still we should not consider it as being on that account a

---

\* ‘Cheap Corn best for Farmers,’ a letter to G. H. Sumner, Esq. M. P., by one of his Constituents—said to be Henry Drummond, Esq., one of our ablest economists, and the founder of the Chair of Political Economy in the University of Oxford.

measure the less imperiously demanded by every consideration of sound policy. If the Corn laws be really beneficial to the producers, they must, for the same reason, be really injurious to the consumers. If they enrich the agriculturists, by securing them higher prices than they would obtain under a free system, they must, to the same extent, impoverish the manufacturing and commercial classes, who are compelled to pay these artificially enhanced prices; while, by raising the rate of wages, they must lower the profits of stock, and operate to force capital out of the kingdom. Nothing, indeed, but the extreme importance of the subject could induce us to stop for a single moment to argue with those who suppose that high prices can, under any circumstances, be advantageous to a nation. To facilitate production, and to make commodities cheaper and more easily obtained, are the grand motives which stimulate the inventive powers of genius, and which lead to the discovery and improvement of machines, and processes for saving labour and diminishing cost; and it is plain that no system of commercial legislation deserves to be supported which does not conspire to promote the same objects. But, instead of promoting, the Corn laws openly and violently counteract them. By preventing the importation of corn from the cheapest markets, they raise its price, and force a large proportion of the capital and industry of the country to engage in a comparatively disadvantageous employment. Such a system cannot be maintained without causing immediate injury and ultimate ruin. Instead of being advantageous, high prices are in *every case* distinctly and completely the reverse. The smaller the sacrifice for which any commodity can be obtained, so much the better. When the labour required to produce, or the money required to purchase, a sufficient supply of corn is diminished, it is as clear as the sun at noon-day that more labour or money must remain to produce or purchase the other necessities, conveniences, or amusements of human life, and that the sum of national wealth and comfort must be proportionally augmented. Those who suppose that a rise of prices can ever be a means of improving the condition of the country, might, with equal reason, suppose that it would be improved by throwing its best soils out of cultivation, and destroying its most powerful machines! The opinions of such persons are not only opposed to the plainest and most obvious principles of economical science, but they are opposed to the obvious suggestions of common sense, and the universal experience of mankind.

In order to simplify the consideration of this great question,

we have argued thus far, on the *supposition* that there is nothing in the circumstances under which the agriculturists of Great Britain are now placed, or in the public burdens imposed on them, that could unfit them for withstanding the free competition of foreigners, or entitle them, in any view of the matter, to claim that a higher duty than 5s. or 6s. a quarter should be imposed on foreign wheat, and proportionally on other foreign corn when imported. But as this is a point of great practical importance, we shall examine it somewhat in detail.

I. In entering upon this examination, it is necessary, in the *first* place, to distinguish between the landlords as such, and the growers of corn. Rent being the excess, or the value of the excess, of the produce obtained from the superior lands of a country, over that portion of their produce or its value, that is required to defray the expenses of their cultivation, and to yield the farmers the common and ordinary rate of profit on their capital, it is obvious that it is altogether *extrinsic* to the cost of production. And therefore it results, that such taxes as fall exclusively on rent, might be augmented so as to absorb it entirely, without in the slightest degree affecting the price of corn. Nothing can affect its price, unless it affects the cost of its production; but rent being a surplus which is over and above that cost, it is quite clear, that it is of no consequence to a cultivator whether the rent which he pays be received by a landlord or a tax-gatherer. Hence, though it should appear that the landlords of this or any other country are heavier taxed than any other class of the community, that circumstance would not afford the shadow of a ground for giving the home-growers of corn a protection against foreign competition. If the opening of the ports should have the effect to throw any *unusual* burden on the landlords, or to impose a sacrifice on them which it does not impose on the rest of the community, they would be entitled to a compensation. But if the opening of the ports would not affect the relative condition of the landlords—if it would have no influence on the burdens which have been long imposed on them, and under which their estates have been acquired, and the existing interests of the country grown up—and if its only effect would be to place industry on a more secure foundation, to avoid the misapplication of a large amount of capital, and the annual loss of from *fourteen* to *fifteen* millions—where is the individual who will contend that the landlords have any right to claim that a duty should be imposed on foreign corn, in order to protect their interests?

II. With respect, in the *second* place, to those taxes or burdens which affect the cultivators of the soil or the producers of

corn, they may be exceedingly heavy without entitling them to a protection from foreign competition. It must be remembered, that *all imported corn must be paid for, either directly or indirectly, by the exportation of some species of manufactured goods* : And it is clear, on the first blush of the matter, that the home producers of corn have not the semblance of a claim to a protecting duty on the importation of foreign corn, unless they can show that the taxes or public charges affecting raw produce, *exceed* those which fall on manufactured goods. We are no apologists for heavy taxation ; but however oppressive it may be—though it were to abstract a fourth or a third part of the income of every individual—still if it affected them all equally, it would leave the relative values of the commodities produced by them exactly where it found them ; and if it did this, it is clear to demonstration, that it could not possibly render any particular class less able than the others to withstand the unfettered competition of foreigners, and could not, therefore, entitle them to a protecting duty. But if higher duties were laid *on a particular class of commodities*, the case would be different. Suppose, for example, that the various duties affecting manufactured commodities amount to only 10, while those affecting the raw produce raised by the agriculturists amount to 20 per cent. ; it is obvious, that, in order to maintain the agriculturists in the same situation as the manufacturers, the price of raw produce must rise 10 per cent. higher than it would be, were it not loaded with that excess of duty ; and it is further obvious, that the exclusion of foreign grain, by enabling the cultivators to diminish the supply, enables them to raise the price, and to throw the burdens peculiarly affecting them on to the consumers. In the event, however, of the ports being opened to the importation of all sorts of foreign corn free of duty, the agriculturists would be deprived of the power of limiting the supply of corn, and, consequently, of raising their prices, so as to indemnify them for the excess of burdens by which we suppose them to be affected. The 10 per cent. excess of duty affecting corn raised at home, would then really operate as a bounty on the importation of that which was raised abroad ; and if it were not defeated by a protecting duty of 10 per cent., the agriculturists would be placed in a relatively disadvantageous position ; and such of them as occupied the poorer description of lands would be driven from their business.

It appears, therefore, that if the growers of corn are only taxed to the same extent as the other classes of producers, they have no claim, whatever may be the absolute magnitude of the burdens laid on them, to a protecting duty. But if they are *more heavily taxed*, they are entitled to demand that a duty

should be charged on all foreign corn when imported, equivalent to the *excess of duties affecting their produce*, as compared with those affecting the produce of the manufacturers. Such a duty, by fitting all classes equally to withstand foreign competition, will preserve them in the same relative situation after the opening of the ports as previously; and will treat all parties, as they ought ever to be treated, with the same equal and impartial justice.

Putting, therefore, the question with respect to protection on this ground, the only tenable one on which it can be put, let us next proceed to inquire whether the agriculturists are really more heavily taxed than the manufacturers or merchants.

The taxes which seem peculiarly to affect the agriculturists, and on the pressure of which they found their claim to a protecting duty, are Tithes—supposed to amount, Ireland included, to about four millions and a half a year—the Land tax amounting to two millions—and Poor rates and other county burdens, computed at about seven millions more—making, in all, about *thirteen millions*.

But, on examination, it will be found, that by far the largest proportion of this sum *has invariably been paid out of rent*, and that it has really no more to do with the cost of producing corn than the taxes laid on tobacco or nutmegs. And, *first*, with respect to tithes:—It has been fully established by Mr Ricardo, that *if all, or nearly all the lands of a country were subject to this charge*, it would, in the event of foreign corn being excluded, or loaded with an *ad valorem* duty of 10 per cent., occasion an equivalent rise in the price of corn, and would, in consequence, fall wholly on the consumers, and not on the landlords or occupiers. And, conformably to this principle, it has been argued, that if the ports were now to be opened for the importation of foreign corn free of duty, the cultivators, unable, by limiting the supply, to raise prices, would relinquish the tillage of bad land; which would have the effect to reduce the rent of the landlords, and to throw a burden wholly on them that has hitherto been borne equally by all classes. But although the principle advanced by Mr Ricardo holds under the circumstances he has supposed, it is essential to observe that, *these are not the circumstances under which the agriculturists of Great Britain are, or ever have been placed*. So far, indeed, is it from being true that all, or nearly all our lands are affected by the burden of tithe, that it appears that about a *THIRD part* of the land of England and Wales is exempted from it\* exclusive of considerable tracts in Ireland, and of

---

\* According to a statement given in the excellent article on England in the Edinburgh Encyclopedia, (vol. ix. p. 32.), the total



the *whole* of Scotland ! And such being the case, it is quite idle to suppose that the cultivators of the tithed lands have had any power so to narrow the supply of corn brought to market, as to throw any considerable portion of the burden of tithes on the consumers. Had the extent of tithe-free land been inconsiderable, they might have thrown the greater part of it upon them ; but when they have had to come into competition, not with a few, but with a third of the cultivators of England, and all those of Scotland, it is obvious that the *price of corn must have been regulated by the price for which it can be raised on the last lands cultivated that are free from tithe*, and not by what it could be raised for on the last lands cultivated that are subject to that charge. It appears, therefore, that if the whole land of the empire had been subject to tithes, the proposition advanced by Mr Ricardo, that tithes do not fall on rent, but on the consumer, would, under the existing restraints on importation, have been strictly true. Inasmuch, however, as this is *not* our situation—as a very large proportion of our lands are not subject to tithes, and the cultivators of the tithed lands are, in consequence, without the means of limiting the supply and raising prices, the proposition advanced by Dr Smith, that tithes constitute a portion of the rent of the land, and that their payment has no effect on the price of corn, is most certainly correct. Neither, it is to be observed, is this a burden recently imposed upon landlords. Tithes have existed for a thousand years ; and having been constantly paid out of rent, it is clear to demonstration, on the principle previously laid down, that the landlords cannot urge the existence of this burden as a reason why a corresponding duty should be laid on foreign corn imported. Tithes form a portion of the rental of the country appropriated by the State, to whom they really belong, to the support of the Church. And though they may be, and we believe with Dr Paley really are, a most noxious institution, they are in no respect more injurious to the landlords than to any other class of the community. Every estate affected by tithe was acquired with a full knowledge that it was liable to that burden, or, which is the same thing, that the public, or, by its permission, the Church, was entitled to a *tenth part* of its gross produce ; and when such is the case, it would not, it is evident, be more absurd to impose a protecting duty on foreign

---

annual value of all the land of England and Wales, in 1815, amounted to 29,476,850*l.* And it also appears, that lands of the annual value of 7,904,378*l.* are wholly tithe free ; while lands of the annual value of 856,183*l.* are tithe free in part, and lands of the annual value of 498,823*l.* pay only a low modus.

corn because copyholders have quit-rents to pay to the lord of the manor, than it would be to impose it because the holders of certain lands have been obliged, for the last thousand years, to pay a tithe to the Church.

That the Land-tax is at this moment, and has always been, a tax on rent, and has no effect on the price of corn, is a fact of which there cannot be the slightest doubt. It was originally imposed in 1693, a new valuation of all the lands in the kingdom having been made in the previous year. According to that valuation, it was found, that a tax of 1s. *on the pound of the ascertained rental*, afforded a clear annual revenue of 500,000*l.* No change has ever been made in the valuation of 1692. The tax, which was at first an annual one, has generally been as high as 4s. a pound of the valued rent. In 1798 it was made perpetual at that rate, leave being at the same time given to the proprietors to redeem it.

Such being the nature and operation of the land-tax, it is obvious, for the reasons already stated, that its existence forms no ground whatever for the imposition of a duty on foreign corn.

The only other burden supposed peculiarly to affect the agriculturists, consists of the Rates levied for the support of the poor, and for other public purposes. But, although we are inclined to think that this burden really presses heavier on them than on any other class, the difference is not very material. Houses, workshops, &c. contribute equally with landed property to the support of the poor: And it should also be observed, that the amount of the rates is by no means a fair criterion of the real weight of this burden; for, owing to the system adopted throughout all the Southern counties of England, of paying wages out of poor-rates, the farmers, it is commonly understood, gain as much, by making the occupiers of houses and villas contribute to the support of the labourers employed by them, as they lose by being more exposed to the rates. Seeing, therefore, that all sorts of fixed property, as well as land, are made to contribute to the rates, that these rates have been improperly enhanced in many counties by the attempts of the landlords and farmers to make those who do not employ labour bear a part of the charges of those who do, and that the abolition of the Corn laws would, as we have already seen, enable the greater part of the rates to be dispensed with, it is clear that the duty which the agriculturists are entitled to claim, on the ground of their being peculiarly affected by the poor-rates, must be very small indeed—perhaps not more than *one per cent. ad valorem*.

However, we would rather err on the side of too much pro-

tection than of too little; and therefore, instead of proposing that an *ad valorem* duty of *one* or *two* per cent.—which latter is certainly all that the agriculturists can justly claim—should be imposed on foreign corn imported, we should not object to its being made as high as *ten* or *twelve* per cent. We have already seen, that the average price at which foreign wheat might be imported into England in ordinary years, would be from 48s. to 55s. a quarter; and we would therefore beg to suggest, in order to get rid of the trickery and fraud inseparable from the average system, that the *ad valorem* duty of 10 or 12 per cent. should be converted into a fixed duty of 5s. or 6s. a quarter on wheat, and other grain in proportion—a power being at the same time granted to the Privy Council to suspend the duty whenever prices in the London market exceed 65s. or 70s. So high a duty would undoubtedly be much too favourable to the landlords. But the vast advantages that would result from the freedom of the corn trade, and the total abolition of all restrictions and fetters on importation, ought to induce the public to waive all objections to its imposition. Its magnitude, too, would take from the landlords every pretence for affirming that they had been harshly treated, or that their interests had been sacrificed to those of others. If they should object to so reasonable a measure, their motives would be obvious to the whole world. It would immediately be seen that they had resolved to place and maintain *their interests, in direct opposition to those of the community in general*;—that they had determined to purchase a hollow and imaginary advantage, by supporting a system of domestic policy which must at no distant period involve them in that ruin which it will assuredly entail on the country.

We believe we might now take leave of this great question; but before doing so, we shall bestow a few words on an argument advanced by the agriculturists, on which they have laid much stress. They allege, that all the principal branches of manufacturing and commercial industry are protected, by means of prohibitory duties, from foreign competition; and they contend, that it is only fair and reasonable that agriculture, which is the most important branch of industry, should enjoy the same protection and favour as the rest. We shall endeavour briefly to ascertain what degree of weight ought to be attached to this rather plausible statement.

In the *first* place, we have to observe, that a prohibition against importation from abroad, or a protecting duty, is plainly of no value whatever to the producers of such commodities as are exported, without the aid of a bounty, to other countries. Those who can undersell foreigners in the *foreign* market, have most certainly but little to fear from their unfettered

competition in the *home* market! And such is the case with the vast majority of the manufacturers of Great Britain. A prohibition against the importation of foreign manufactured goods is really of no more consequence to them, than a prohibition against the importation of foreign corn would be to the agriculturists of Poland or Russia. All our principal manufactured goods—such, for example, as woollens, cotton stuffs and yarn, hardware, leather, &c. &c., can be produced cheaper here than in any other country; and the proof of this is, that we are able to export them with profit, not only to our immediate neighbours, but to the remotest districts of China or Hindostan. The duties intended to protect them may therefore be repealed without the slightest inconvenience; they are, to all intents and purposes, a mere dead letter; and serve only to encumber the statute-book, and to afford, as in this case, the shadow of an argument to real monopolists.

Such, too, we are happy to say, is the view that is now almost universally taken by our most intelligent manufacturers of the operation of the laws restricting the importation of foreign manufactured goods. In 1820, petitions were presented to Parliament from London, Liverpool, Glasgow, Manchester, Bristol, Leeds, and all the other great commercial and manufacturing towns throughout the empire, in which the petitioners distinctly and strongly stated their conviction, we quote the words of the London petition, of the ‘impolicy and injustice’ of the restrictive system; and prayed for ‘*a total repeal of all such prohibitions and duties as had for their object to exclude foreign commodities.*’ No sooner had Messrs Robinson and Huskisson been placed in those high situations which they now fill with so much credit to themselves and advantage to the country, than they endeavoured to give effect to the prayer of the petitioners. In consequence, the system of absolute prohibition has been almost wholly abandoned; and a system of *ad valorem* duties has been, in most instances, adopted in its stead. Thus, for example, by the Acts passed in 1824–5, the ports of Great Britain are opened to the importation of *foreign cotton manufactured goods*, on their paying an *ad valorem* importation duty of TEN per cent. Foreign *woollen* goods are admitted on paying a duty of 15 per cent. Foreign earthen-ware on the same duty as woollens. Foreign cast-iron on a duty of 10 per cent.; and wrought foreign iron on a duty of 20 per cent., and so on.

It is in vain, therefore, that the agriculturists endeavour to apologize for the restrictions on the importation of foreign corn, by telling us, that they are required to place agriculture in the *same* situation as the other branches of industry. The re-

strictions on the importation of foreign manufactured goods are almost universally without effect; those for whose protection and advantage they were intended, have themselves petitioned Parliament for their abolition; and, in point of fact, they do not at this moment *exceed*, on the most important articles, the protection we have proposed granting to the agriculturists.

But there are yet other, and still more cogent reasons than any previously stated, why the Corn laws should be abolished. The sustenance of the people is certainly the very last thing with which a wise and prudent Government would choose to tamper. We have no hesitation, indeed, in avowing it to be our decided opinion, that it will be found to be impossible to maintain the Corn laws without deeply endangering the public tranquillity and the security of property. *NESCIT PLEBS JEJUNA TIMERE*. Mobs and popular outrages are the necessary consequence of a dearth of corn. It must be obvious to every one, that were our restrictions and prohibitions abolished, the price of corn in a country, so rich and industrious as England, so well supplied with merchandize suited to the wants and desires of every people, could never rise considerably above the level of the surrounding markets. When, therefore, prices rise above this their natural limit, as they are sure to do under our present system, whenever the home harvest is in any degree deficient, the cause of the high price will be obvious to the whole world. Every one will see that the dearth is not real, but artificial:—that ‘it is not by the dispensations of Providence—dispensations which it would be unavailing to canvass, and impious to censure’—but by the perverse regulations of man that he is oppressed, and his means of existence compromised. Those who are prepared to defend such a system, must be prepared to meet the bloodshed and commotion of which it cannot fail to be productive. Is it in the nature of things, that a vast manufacturing and commercial population, like that of England, should continue quietly to submit to a system which narrows the market for their produce, at the same time that it forces them to pay 70s. or 80s., or perhaps 90s. or 100s., for the same quantity of bread they might otherwise obtain for 50s. or 55s.? Sooner or later, this system must be abandoned. But the longer it is maintained, the more will the public mind be alienated from the Legislature, and the more will the spirit of disaffection scatter its seeds and spread its roots throughout the country. The experience of 1817, 1818 and 1819, should not be thrown away. The restriction on importation was the sole cause of the oppressively high prices of these years; and it was these high prices that drove the manufacturing classes to des-

pair—that rendered them the ready dupes of violent and designing persons—and produced those outrages that were productive of so much mischief.

We cannot dismiss this subject, without entreating ministers to persevere in their avowed resolution to bring the whole question with respect to the Corn laws before Parliament in the ensuing Session. They have already done a great deal to relieve the commerce and industry of the country from the shackles imposed in a less enlightened age; and, notwithstanding the outcry and clamour that a small faction, opposed to every species of improvement, and attached to every thing that is antiquated and vicious, has raised against them, they may be assured that their late measures are cordially approved by the vast majority of the middle classes. Of Mr Huskisson in particular, against whom every species of ribbald abuse has been cast, we have no hesitation in saying, that he has done more to improve our commercial policy during the short period since he became President of the Board of Trade, than all the ministers who have preceded him for the last hundred years. And it ought to be remembered to his honour, that the measures he has suggested, and the odium thence arising, have not been proposed and incurred by him in the view of serving any Party purpose, but solely because he believed, and most justly, that these measures were sound in principle, and calculated to promote the real and lasting interests of the public. That such a man should have been assailed in the way that he has been, is most discreditable to the country, or rather to the foul-mouthed junto who have indited the libels in question. We have no doubt, however, that these efforts to traduce and vilify his motives and conduct are heartily despised by him; and that he will not allow them to have the slightest influence in making him swerve from the broad and well defined path, which principle, and his own good sense, point out. Mr Huskisson and his colleagues cannot but feel that their commercial system is altogether incomplete, so long as the present Corn laws are allowed to disgrace the Statute-book;—and they must feel, that they impose a heavy and most oppressive burden on the country, at the same time that they expose the people to the scourge of famine, and deeply endanger the safety and tranquillity of the State. Surely, then, it is not too much to call upon them to act with consistency, firmness, and vigour on this occasion; and to earn for themselves a new and more powerful claim on the gratitude of the country, by ridding it, at once and for ever, of the monstrous and intolerable nuisance of Corn Laws.

ART. III. *Memoires de M. FALKENSKIOLD, Officier-Général dans le Service de S. M. Danoise, à l'Epoque de la Catastrophe du COMTE DE STRUENSEE.* Londres et Paris, Treuttel et Würtz.

GENERAL FALKENSKIOLD, the author of these Memoirs, was a Danish gentleman of respectable family, who, after having served in the French army during the Seven-Years War, and in the Russian army during the first war of Catherine II. against the Turks, was recalled to his country under the administration of Struensee, to take a part in the reform of the military establishment, and to conduct the negotiation at Petersburg, respecting the claims of the Imperial family to the Dutchy of Holstein. He was involved in the fall of Struensee in the beginning of 1772, and was, without trial, doomed to imprisonment for life at Munkholm, a fortress situated on a rock opposite to Drontheim, in the sixty-fourth degree of north latitude. After five years imprisonment he was released, and permitted to live, first at Montpellier, and afterwards at Lausanne, at which last city (with the exception of one journey to Copenhagen) he past the latter part of his life, and where he died in September 1820, in the eighty-third year of his age. He left these Memoirs for publication, to his friend M. Secretan, First Judge of the canton of Vaud, who died in the month of May last, when he had almost brought this volume through the press.

It is a respectable, but not amusing book; and as it is the only account known to us of what is called the Danish Revolution of 1772, written by a man of estimable character, who was a victim of that sanguinary intrigue, and had been an actor in the measures which furnished a pretext for it, we are inclined to think, that a brief abridgement of M. Falkenskiold's narrative, with a few additions from other sources, may not be unacceptable to our readers. The remarks with which it seems proper to introduce it will be short.

The constitutional history of the Northern Monarchies has either been unsuccessfully cultivated, or is little known in this country.\* The Danish monarchy was elective; but the choice was confined to the reigning family, and generally fell on the eldest son, or on the nearest male. The Privy Council, a body

---

\* Books in Danish are in this country almost sealed volumes. Suhm's Historical Works on Denmark, are said to be of great value. We have also heard that a good history of Norway has lately appeared. What admirable materials now exist in the various languages of Europe for an 'Universal History' really worthy of the name!

composed of the great officers of state, and of others named by the King, but by fixed rules, exercised the executive power. The King was little more than President of the Council, and Commander of the Forces. The clergy being impoverished by the Reformation, and the towns not having acquired importance by traffic, the whole power of the States-General was substantially vested in the order of nobility, who became the absolute masters of the State. The peasants, at least of the Royal demesnes, had, till the reign of Waldemar II. in 1240, formed a fourth estate as in Sweden, and in the Tirol; but with the exception of a few districts in Jutland, they had fallen into that condition of villanage in which the peasants on the lands of the nobility (as far as our dim lights reach) appear previously to have been. A more exact account of the state of the Scandinavian Serfs, and of the causes which reduced them to bondage, in a country where there was no foreign conquest to account for so wretched a degradation, would be a valuable contribution towards the history of the rise, progress, and decline of personal and predial slavery in Europe; a work yet to be written, which would fill up an important void in the annals of the human race. In Great Britain such a work might prove of great and immediate utility, by contributing somewhat towards the solution of the tremendous problem which the situation of her American colonies now presents; though it would neither answer that nor any other valuable purpose, if the mind of the writer were contracted by a regard to passing events. There seem to be few undertakings more likely to requite the labour of an impartial and industrious writer of pure taste, and acute discernment, with a mind enlarged by philosophy, and well acquainted with the laws and languages of the European nations. It might be worthy of the historian of the middle ages, if he were not employed in continuing that part of his great work, which relates to the constitutional history of his own country. \*

In the reign of Frederic III., who ascended the throne in 1648, Denmark was engaged in a disastrous war with Sweden, her provinces on the north of the Baltic were reduced, the ca-

---

\* How can the antiquity of families be ascertained in Denmark, where few of the nobility had surnames till the Reformation? There were no titles of honour known in Sweden till the reign of Gustavus Vasa, in the middle of the sixteenth century; nor we believe in Norway till our times. Did any nobility exist anciently in these countries? What is the history of the order of peasants in the Swedish Diet, and of slavery in Sweden? We are unable to give a satisfactory answer to these questions.



pital was on the eve of surrender, and the monarchy was preserved from annihilation by the fleets of the republics of England and Holland. The peace was disgraceful, the country had been laid waste, the finances were exhausted, the army was unpaid and mutinous, the administration discredited, and the government without power. No resource seemed to remain but an assembly of the States who were expected in some degree to restore order and general confidence.

This assembly accordingly met at Copenhagen in the autumn of the year 1660, for the first time since 1536. The Burghers had distinguished themselves by bravery in the defence of the capital. The Church, too poor since the Reformation to afford a provision for young noblemen, had wholly fallen into the hands of the commons. The Nobility were generally suspected of being so unduly actuated by their jealousy of the crown, as to have obstructed the king's measures for public defence. They increased their unpopularity, by now maintaining their own exemption from an equal share of the public burdens; against the first principle of all prudent aristocracies, who never become the rivals of their subjects for profit, and secure their collective power by curbing the license of individual members; but conformably to the conduct of our present sticklers for Corn laws and Game laws, who think it wise policy to lay themselves open to the charge of valuing the food of the people less than their own rent, and of sacrificing the liberty of fifteen hundred men in every year to their sports.

Suane, Bishop of Zealand, and Namsen, first Burgomaster of Copenhagen, the speakers of the clergy and the commons, prevailed on these two plebeian orders to curb the insolent domination of the nobles by rendering the crown hereditary. The proposed law was carried to the Nobility, who were so exasperated at this attempt to deprive them of the power of naming the sovereign, that Otto Krug, one of their number, told the two inferior orders that they were unfree. The burghers and clergy showed their resentment at this insult, and Namsen the speaker, perceiving the temper of his colleagues, instantly answered, 'We are not slaves, and the nobles shall soon know it to their cost.' The nobles rejected the bill, on the pretext that the succession to the crown was not among the objects for which the Diet was called together. The two orders, prepared no doubt for this rejection, on the 10th October 1660, laid their decree before the King. Some of the ministers had already entered into some degree of concert with the popular chiefs. The soldiery had been sounded; they were found to have a fellow-feeling with the classes of society from which they sprung, and were easily inflamed against a nobility at once

haughty and sordid, who refused to contribute to the funds for their pay. The governor was gained over by the Court; the populace applauded the resistance to aristocratical tyranny; courage and ambition were breathed into the phlegmatic soul of the King by his consort Sophia Amelia of Brunswick Lunenburgh; a Princess distinguished by talents, spirit, and an aspiring character. He gave a timid approbation to the proposals. The nobility attempted to leave the city, in order to protest against the legality of a Diet acting without liberty; but the gates were shut on them. They attempted too late to save some appearance of dignity by modifying their concession, proposing to limit the hereditary succession to males. Nothing was left but unconditional submission. On the 15th of October, the Three Orders presented the law for the establishment of hereditary succession to the King, returning to him the capitulation which he had originally subscribed, and absolving him from his coronation oath. An oath of allegiance was taken, without any reciprocal oath by the King. A discussion then arose about the other alterations in the government, which the abolition of elective monarchy seemed to require. The Bishop of Zealand, availing himself of the mutual jealousy between the Orders, and of the little fear which all felt of a feeble and indolent Prince; perhaps honestly apprehensive that questions so deeply interesting, as those which regarded a new distribution of the supreme authority, might, at so critical a moment, occasion commotion and confusion, prevailed on all parties, by a sudden and tumultuary resolution, to vest in the Crown a discretionary, or, as he softly expressed it, a mediatorial power of framing the new constitutional arrangements. Whether he acted from a previous design, or really from fear of the agitation which he saw rising; or whether he was aware of the natural consequences of his own proposition, are questions which must be answered (if they can be so at all) by those who are more deeply read in the secret history of that period. The single and suspected voice of the Senator Gersdorff, an obnoxious member of the deposed aristocracy, was feebly and vainly raised, to express a hope that not an Eastern despotism, but a wisely limited monarchy, was to be the fruit of the revolution. On the 15th of January 1661, each of the three Orders separately presented to the King a decree, rendering the crown hereditary in the female as well as male line, and conferring on him the power of regulating the distribution of all political authority, under the hereditary monarchy. In 1665, the King, by virtue of the powers conferred on him by the States, promulgated 'the Royal Law' (in imitation of the *Lex Regia* of the servile lawyers of Imperial Rome), which has ever since been the only fundamental law of Denmark. The Kings of Den-

mark were therein declared absolute sovereigns, superior to all human laws, and uniting in their own persons all powers and rights of making, repealing, amending, and administering laws, and of acting in all respects according to their good pleasure, except that they could neither alter the established Lutheran Church, nor partition the monarchy, nor change the royal law itself. Thus, perhaps for the first and only time, was despotism established by law, in a civilized age, in a country which possessed the elements of a free government, without a drop of blood spilt, or a single sword drawn in defence of liberty. \*

Isord Molesworth, who was minister from King William to the Court of Copenhagen, has given a lively picture of the state of Denmark about thirty years after this legal establishment of despotism.

His elegant Work † breathes the wise and generous spirit of liberty, which the Revolution had awakened in the hearts of the English youth. Like Locke and Addison, he laboured to teach his countrymen the value of civil and religious freedom, by exhibiting the direful effects of absolute power. But he avows his honest purpose; his opportunities of observation were unquestionable; and there is no pretence for disputing his veracity in the statement of facts. The eighth chapter of his book presents an apparently accurate account of the miserable state of Denmark under the absolute monarchy; and though some part of it may be charged on the misrule of the deposed aristocracy, while a still greater portion must, under both governments, be ascribed to the villanage of the husbandmen, enough will still remain to illustrate the character of unlimited monarchy, even without the aid of the still more important consideration, that the continuance of these previous evils must be laid to the charge of a revolution, which, by destroying popular and representative assemblies, blocked up the channels through which alone public opinion can affect national measures, and annihilated all pacific means of reforming abuse.

It became a fashion, however, among slavish sophists, to quote the example of Denmark as a proof of the harmlessness of despotism, and of the indifference of forms of government. ‘Even in Denmark,’ it was said, ‘where the King is legally absolute, civil liberty is respected, justice is well administered, the persons and property of men are secure, the whole administration is more moderate and mild than that of most

---

\* Molesworth’s *Denmark*, 52. Ancillon, *Rev. de l’Europe*, vi. Koch, *Tableau des Rev.* ii. Mallet, *Hist. de Danemar.* iii. Dumont, *Corps Diplomatique*, vi.

† Molesworth’s *Account of Denmark in 1692*. Lond. 1694.

' governments which are called free. The progress of civilization, and the power of public opinion, more than supply the place of popular institutions.' These representations were aided by that natural disposition of the human mind, when a good consequence unexpectedly appears to spring from a bad institution, to be hurried into the extreme of doubting whether the institution be not itself good, without waiting to balance the evil against the good, or even duly to ascertain the reality of the good. No species of discovery produces so agreeable a surprise, and consequently so much readiness to assent to its truth, as that of the benefits of an evil. There are no paradoxes more captivating than the apologies of old abuses and corruptions.

The honest narrative of Falkenskiold, however, tells us a different tale. The first of the despotic Kings, jealous of the nobility, bestowed the highest offices on adventurers, who were either foreigners, or natives of the lowest sort. Such is the universal practice of Eastern tyrants. Such was, for a century, the condition of Spain, the most Oriental of European countries. The same characteristic feature of despotism is observable in the history of Russia. All talent being extinguished among the superior classes, by withdrawing every object which excites and exercises the faculties, the Prince finds a common capacity for business only abroad, or among the lowest classes of his subjects. Bernstorff a Hanoverian, Lynar a Saxon, and St Germain a Frenchman, were among the ablest of the Danish ministers. The country was governed for a hundred years by foreigners. Unacquainted with Denmark, and disdaining even to acquire its language, they employed Danish servants as their confidential agents, and placed them in all the secondary offices. The natives followed their example. Footmen occupied important offices. So prevalent was this practice, that a law was at length passed by the ill-fated Struensee, to forbid this new rule of freedmen. Some of the foreign ministers, with good intentions, introduced ostentatious establishments, utterly unsuitable to one of the poorest countries of Europe. With a population of two millions and a half, and an annual revenue of a million and a half sterling, Denmark, in 1769, had on foot an army of sixty-six thousand men; so that about a ninth of the males of the age of labour were constantly idle and under arms. There was a debt of near ten millions sterling, after fifty years peace. An inconvertible paper money, always discredited and daily fluctuating, rendered contracts nugatory, and made it impossible to determine the value of property, or to estimate the wages of labour. The barren and

mountainous country of Norway, out of a population of seven hundred thousand souls, contributed twenty thousand men to the army, nine thousand to a local militia, and fourteen thousand enrolled for naval service, forming a total of forty-three thousand conscripts, the fourth part of the labouring males being thus set apart by conscription for military service. The majority of the officers of the army were foreign, and the words of command were given in the German language. The navy was disproportioned to the part of the population habitually employed in maritime occupation; but it was the natural force of the country. The seamen were skilful and brave; and their gallant resistance to Nelson, in 1801, is the greatest honour of the Danish name in modern times. Their colonies were useless and costly.

The administration of law was neither just nor humane. The torture was in constant use. The treatment of the galley-slaves at Copenhagen caused travellers, who had seen the Mediterranean ports, to shudder. One of the mild modes of removing an unpopular minister was to send him a prisoner for life to a dungeon under the Arctic Circle.

The effect of absolute government in debasing the rulers, was remarkable in Denmark. One of the principal amusements of Frederic V., who sat on the throne from 1746 to 1766, consisted in mock matches at boxing and wrestling with his favourites, in which it was not always safe to gain an advantage over the Royal gladiator. His son and successor, Christian VII., was either originally deficient in understanding, or had, by vicious practices in boyhood, so much impaired his mental faculties, that considerable wonder was felt at Copenhagen at his being allowed, in 1768, to display his imbecility in a tour through a great part of Europe. The elder Bernstorff, then at the head of the Council, was unable to restrain the King and his favourite Stolk from this indiscreet exposure. Such, however, is the power of 'the solemn plausibilities of the world,' that, in France, this unhappy person was complimented by academies, and, in England, works of literature were inscribed to him.\* On his arrival at Altona, he was in need of a physician; an attendant whom his prematurely broken constitution made peculiarly essential to him even at the age of nineteen. Struensee, the son of a Lutheran bishop in Holstein, had just begun to practise medicine at Altona, after having been for some time employed as the editor of a newspaper in that city, and was now appointed physician to the King, at the moment when he was projecting a professional establishment at Malaga,

---

\* Sir W. Jones's Life of Nadr Shah.

or a voyage to India, which his imagination, excited by the perusal of the elder travellers, had covered with 'barbaric pearl and gold.' He was then twenty-nine years old, and appears to have been recommended to the Royal favour, by an agreeable exterior, pleasing manner, some slight talents and superficial knowledge, with all the subserviency indispensable to a favourite, and with a power of amusing his listless and exhausted master. His name appears in the publications of the time as 'Doctor Struensee,' among the attendants of his Danish Majesty in England, and he received, in that character, the honorary degree of Doctor of Medicine from the University of Oxford. Like all other minions, his ascent was rapid, or rather his flight to the pinnacle of power was instantaneous; for the passion of an absolute prince on such occasions knows no bounds, and brooks no delay. Immediately after the King's return to Copenhagen, Struensee was appointed a Cabinet minister; his brother was made a counsellor of justice; he appointed Brandt, another adventurer, to superintend the palace and the imbecile King: he intrusted Rantzau, a disgraced Danish minister, who had been his colleague in the editorship of the *Altona Journal*, with the conduct of foreign affairs; he and his friend Brandt were created Earls. Stolk, his predecessor in favour, had fomented and kept up an animosity between the King and Queen. Struensee (unhappily for himself as well as for her) gained the confidence of the Queen, by restoring her to the good graces of her husband. Caroline Matilda, the sister of George III., who then had the misfortune to be Queen of Denmark, is described by Falkenskiöld as the handsomest woman of the Court, of a mild and reserved character, and who was well qualified to enjoy and impart happiness, if it had been her lot to be united to an endurable husband. Brandt seems to have been a weak coxcomb, and Rantzau a turbulent and ungrateful intriguer.

The only foreign business which Struensee found pending on his entrance into office, was a negotiation with Russia, concerning the pretensions of that formidable competitor to a part of Holstein, which Denmark had unjustly acquired fifty years before. Peter III., the head of the house of Holstein; was proud of his German ancestry, and ambitious of recovering their ancient dominions. After his murder, Catharine claimed these possessions, as nominal Regent of Holstein, during the minority of her son. The last act of Bernstorff's administration was a very prudent accommodation, in which Russia agreed to relinquish her claims on Holstein, in consideration of the cession to her by Denmark of the small principality of Oldenburg, the very

ancient patrimony of the Danish Royal Family. Rantzau, who in his exile had some quarrel with the Russian Government, prevailed on the inexperienced Struensee to delay the execution of this politic convention, and aimed at establishing the influence of France and Sweden at Copenhagen instead of that of Russia, which was then supported by England. He even entertained the chimerical project of driving the empress from Petersburg. Falkenskiold, who had been sent on a mission to Petersburg, endeavoured, after his return, to disabuse Struensee, to show him the ruinous tendency of such rash counsels, and even proposed to him to recall Bernstorff, to facilitate that good understanding which could hardly be restored as long as Counts Osten and Rantzau, the avowed enemies of Russia, were in power. Struensee, like most of those who must be led by others, was exceedingly fearful of being thought to be so. When Falkenskiold warned him against yielding to Rantzau, his plans were shaken. But when the same weapon was turned against Falkenskiold, Struensee returned to his obstinacy. Even after Rantzau had become his declared enemy, he adhered to the plans of that intriguer lest he should be suspected of yielding to Falkenskiold. Wherever there were only two roads, it was easy to lead Struensee, by exciting his fear of being led by the opposite party.

His measures of internal policy appear to have been generally well-meant, but often ill-judged. Some of his reforms were in themselves excellent. But he showed on the whole a meddling and restless spirit, impatient of the necessary delay, often employed in petty change, choosing wrong means, braving prejudices that might have been softened, and offending interests that might have been conciliated. He was a sort of inferior Joseph II.; like him, rather a servile copyist than an enlightened follower of Frederick II. His dissolution of the Guards (in itself a prudent measure of economy) turned a numerous body of volunteers into the service of his enemies. The removal of Bernstorff was a very blamable means of strengthening himself. The suppression of the Privy Council, the only feeble restraint on despotic power, was still more reprehensible in itself, and excited the just resentment of the Danish nobility. The repeal of a barbarous law, inflicting capital punishment on adultery, was easily misrepresented to the people as a mark of approbation of that vice. Both Struensee and Brandt had embraced the infidelity at that time prevalent among men of the world, which consisted in little more than a careless transfer of implied faith from Luther to Voltaire. They had been acquainted with the leaders of the philosophical party at Paris,

and they introduced the conversation of their masters at Copenhagen. In the same school they were taught to see clearly enough the distempers of European society; but they were not taught (for their teachers did not know) which of these maladies were to be endured, which were to be palliated, and what were the remedies and regimen by which the remainder might in due time be effectually and yet safely removed. The dissolute manners of the Court contributed to their unpopularity; rather perhaps because the nobility resented the intrusion of upstarts into the sphere of their privileged vice, than because there was any *réal* increase of licentiousness. It must not be forgotten that he was the first minister of an absolute monarchy who abolished the torture, and that he patronised those excellent plans for the emancipation of the enslaved husbandmen, which were first conceived by Reverdil, a Swiss, and of which the adoption by the second Bernstorff has justly immortalized that statesman. He will be honoured by after ages for what offended the Lutheran clergy—the free exercise of religious worship granted to Calvinists, to Moravians, and even to Catholics; for the Danish clergy were ambitious of retaining the right to persecute, not only long after it was impossible to exercise it, but even after they had lost the disposition to do so; at first to overawe, afterwards to degrade non-conformists; in both stages, as a badge of the privileges and honour of an established church. No part however of Struensee's private or public conduct can be justly considered as the *cause* of his downfall. His irreligion, his immoralities, his precipitate reforms, his parade of invidious favour, were only the instruments or pretexts by which his competitors for office were able to effect his destruction. Had he either purchased the good will, or destroyed the power of his enemies at Court, he might long have governed Denmark, and perhaps have been gratefully remembered by posterity as a reformer of political abuses. He fell a victim to an intrigue for a change of ministers, which, under such a King, was really a struggle for the sceptre.

His last act of political imprudence illustrates both the character of his enemies, and the nature of absolute government. When he was appointed Secretary of the Cabinet, he was empowered to execute such orders as were very urgent, without the signature of the King, on condition, however, that they should be weekly laid before that Prince, to be confirmed or annulled by him under his own hand. This liberty had been practised before his administration; and it was repeated in many thousand instances after his downfall. Under any monarchy, the *substantial* fault would have consisted rather in assuming an



independence on his colleagues, than in encroaching on any Royal power which was real or practicable. Under so wretched a pageant as the King of Denmark, Struensee showed his folly in obtaining, by a formal order, the power which he might easily have continued to execute without it. But this order was the signal of a clamour against him, as an usurper of Royal prerogative. The guards showed symptoms of mutiny. The garrison of the capital adopted their resentment. The populace became riotous. Rantzau, partly stimulated by revenge against Struensee, for having refused a protection to him against his creditors, being secretly favoured by Count Osten, though then a minister, found means of gaining over Guldberg, an ecclesiastic of obscure birth, full of professions of piety, the preceptor of the King's brother, who prevailed on that Prince and the Queen-Dowager to engage in the design of subverting the administration. Several of Struensee's friends warned him of his danger; but, whether from levity or magnanimity, he neglected their admonitions. Rantzau himself, either jealous of the ascendant acquired by Guldberg among the conspirators, or visited by some compunctious remembrances of friendship and gratitude, spoke to Falkenskiold confidentially of the prevalent rumours, and tendered his services for the preservation of his former friend. Falkenskiold distrusted the advances of Rantzau, and answered coldly, 'Speak to Struensee.' Rantzau turned away, saying, 'He will not listen to *me*.' Two days after, on the 16th of January 1772, there was a brilliant masked ball at Court, where the conspirators and their victims mingled in the festivities (as was observed by some foreign ministers present) with more than usual gayety. At four o'clock in the morning, the Queen-Dowager, who was the King's step-mother, her son, and Count Rantzau, entered the King's bed-chamber, compelled his valet to awaken him, and required him to sign an order to apprehend the Queen, the Counts Struensee and Brandt, who, with other conspirators, were then engaged (as they pretended) in a plot to depose, if not to murder him. He is said to have hesitated, from fear or obstinacy, perhaps from some remnant of humanity and moral restraint. But he soon yielded; and his verbal assent, or perhaps a silence produced by terror, was thought a sufficient warrant. Rantzau, with three officers, rushed with his sword drawn into the apartment of the Queen, compelled her to rise from her bed, and, in spite of her tears and threats, sent her, half-dressed, a prisoner to the fortress of Cronenbourg, with her infant daughter Louisa, whom she was then suckling, and lady Mostyn, an English lady who attended her. Struensee and Brandt were

in the same night thrown into prison, and loaded with irons. On the next day, the King was paraded through the streets in a carriage drawn by eight milk-white horses, as if triumphing after a glorious victory over his enemies, in which he had saved his country. The city was illuminated. The preachers of the established church are charged by several concurring witnesses with inhuman and unchristian invectives from the pulpit against the Queen and the fallen ministers; the good doubtless believing too easily the tale of the victors; the base paying court to the dispensers of preferment; and the bigotted greedily swallowing the most incredible accusations against unbelievers. The populace, inflamed by these declamations, demolished or pillaged from sixty to a hundred houses.

The conspirators distributed among themselves the chief offices. The King was suffered to fall into his former nullity. The formality of his signature was dispensed with. The affairs of the kingdom were conducted in his name, till his son was of age to assume the regency. Guldberg, under the modest title of Secretary of the Cabinet, became Prime Minister. Rantzau was appointed a Privy Councillor, and Osten retained the department of Foreign Affairs; but it is consolatory to add; that, after a few months, both were discarded at the instance of the Court of Petersburg, to complete the desired exchange of Holstein with Oldenburgh.

The object of the conspiracy being thus accomplished, the conquerors proceeded, as usual, to those judicial proceedings against the prisoners, which are intended formally to justify the violence of a victorious faction, but substantially aggravate its guilt. A commission was appointed to try the accused. Its leading members were the chiefs of the conspiracy,—men who could not acquit their opponents without confessing themselves to be deeply guilty. *Guldberg*, one of the members, had to determine, by the sentence which he pronounced, whether he was himself a rebel. General Eichstedt, the President, had personally arrested several of the prisoners, and was, by his judgment on Struensee, who had been his benefactor, to decide, that the criminality of that minister was of so deep a dye as to cancel the obligations of gratitude. To secure his impartiality still more, he was appointed a Minister, and promised the office of Preceptor of the Hereditary Prince,—the permanence of which appointments must have partly depended on the general conviction that the prisoners were guilty.

The charges against Struensee and Brandt are dated on the 21st of April 1772. The defence of Struensee was drawn up by his counsel on the 22d; that of Brandt was prepared on the

23d. Sentence was pronounced against both on the 25th. On the 27th it was approved, and ordered to be executed by the King. On the 28th, after their right hands were cut off on the scaffold, they were beheaded. For three months they had been closely and very cruelly imprisoned. The proceedings of the commission were secret. The prisoners were not confronted with each other; they heard no witnesses; they read no depositions; they do not appear to have seen any counsel till they had received the indictments. It is characteristic of this scene to add, that the King went to the Opera on the 25th, after signifying his approbation of the sentence; and that, on the 27th, the day of its solemn confirmation, there was a masqued ball at Court. On the 28th, the day of execution, the King again went to the Opera. The passion which prompts an absolute monarch to raise an unworthy favourite to honour, is still less disgusting than the levity and hardness with which, on the first alarm, he always abandons the same favourite to destruction. It may be observed, that the very persons who had represented the patronage of operas and masquerades as one of the offences of Struensee, were the same who thus unseasonably paraded their unhappy Sovereign through a succession of such amusements.

The volume before us contains the written answers of Struensee to the preliminary questions of the commission, the substance of the charges against him, and the defence made by his counsel. The first was written on the 14th of April, when he was alone in a dungeon, with irons on his hands and feet, and an iron collar fastened to the wall round his neck. The indictment is prefaced by a long declamatory invective against his general conduct and character, such as still dishonour the criminal proceedings of most nations, and from which England has probably been saved by the scholastic subtlety and dryness of her system of what is called special pleading. Laying aside his supposed connexion with the Queen, which is reserved for a few separate remarks, the charges are either perfectly frivolous, or sufficiently answered by his counsel, in a defence which he was allowed only one day to prepare, and which bears evident marks of being written with the fear of the victorious faction before the eyes of the feeble advocate. One is, that he caused the young Prince to be trained so hardily as to endanger his life; in answer to which, he refers to the judgment of physicians, appeals to the restored health of the young Prince, and observes, that even if he had been wrong, his fault could have been no more than an error of judgment. The truth is, that he was guilty of a ridiculous mimicry of the early education of *Emile*, at a time when all Europe was intoxicated by the writings of

Rousseau. To the second charge, that he had issued, unknown to the King, an order for the incorporation of the Foot Guards with the troops of the line on the 21st of December 1771; and, on their refusal to obey, had obtained an order from the King on the 24th for their reduction. He answered, that the draught of the order had been read and approved by the King on the 21st, signed and sealed by him on the 23d, and finally confirmed by the order for reducing the refractory guards, as issued by his Majesty on the 24th; so that he could scarcely be said to have been even in form guilty of a two days usurpation. It might have been added, that it was immediately fully pardoned by the Royal confirmation; that Rantzau, and others of his enemies, had taken an active share in it; and that it was so recent, that the conspirators must have resolved on their measures before its occurrence, which reduces it to a mere pretext. He was charged with taking or granting exorbitant pensions; and he answered, seemingly with truth, that they were not higher than those of his predecessors. He was accused also of having falsified the public accounts; to which his answer is necessarily too detailed for our purpose, but appears to be satisfactory. Both these offences, if they had been committed, could not have been treated as high treason in any country not wholly barbarous; and the evidence on which the latter and more precise of the charges rested, was a declaration of the imbecile and imprisoned King on an intricate matter of account reported to such a tribunal by an agent of enemies who had determined on the destruction of the prisoner.

Thus stands the case of the unfortunate Struensee on all the charges but one, as it appears in the accusation which his enemies had such time and power to support, and on the defence made for him under such cruel disadvantages. That he was innocent of the political offences laid to his charge, is rendered highly probable by the 'Narrative of his Conversion,' published soon after his execution by Dr Munter, a divine of Copenhagen, appointed by the Danish government to attend him; \* a composition, which bears the strongest marks of the probity and sincerity of the writer, and is a perfect model of the manner in which a person, circumstanced like Struensee, ought to be treated by a kind and considerate minister of religion. Men of all opinions who peruse this narrative, must own that it is impossible to touch the wounds of a sufferer with more tenderness, to reconcile the agitated penitent to

---

\* Reprinted by the late learned and exemplary Mr Rennell of Kensington. London, 1824.

himself, to present religion as the consoler, not as the disturber of his dying moments, gently to dispose him to try his own actions by a higher test of morality, to fill his mind with indulgent benevolence towards his fellow-men, and to exalt it to a reverential love of boundless perfection. Dr Munter deserved the confidence of Struensee, and seems entirely to have won it. The unfortunate man freely owned his private licentiousness, his success in corrupting the principles of the victims of his desires, his rejection not only of religion, but also in theory, but not quite in feeling, of whatever ennobles and elevates the mind in morality; the imprudence and rashness by which he brought ruin on his friends, and plunged his parents in deep affliction; and the ignoble and impure motives of all his public actions, which, in the eye of reason, deprived them of that pretension to virtuous character to which their outward appearance might seem to entitle them. He felt for his friends with unusual tenderness. Instead of undue concealment from Munter, he is perhaps chargeable with betraying to him secrets which were not exclusively his own. But he denies the truth of the political charges against him; more especially of speculation and falsification of accounts. (*Munter*, 112. 113. 122. 129. 130. 160, particularly 166 and 167. 171. 190.)

The charges against Brandt would be altogether unworthy of consideration, were it not for the light which one of them throws on the whole of this atrocious procedure. The main accusation against him was, that he had beaten, flogged, and scratched the sacred person of the King. His answer was, that the King, who had a passion for wrestling and boxing, had repeatedly challenged him to a match, had severely beaten him five or six times; that he did not gratify his master's taste till after these provocations; that two of the witnesses against him, servants of the King, had indulged their master in the same sport; and that he received liberal gratifications, and continued to enjoy the Royal favour for months after this pretended treason. The King inherited this perverse taste in amusements from his father, whose palace was the theatre of the like kingly sports. It is impossible to entertain the least doubt of the truth of this defence. It affords a natural and probable explanation of a fact which would be otherwise incomprehensible.

A suit for divorce was commenced against the Queen, on the ground of criminal connexion with Struensee, who was himself convicted of high treason for that connexion. This unhappy Princess was sacrificed, at the age of seventeen, to the brutal caprices of a husband, who, if he had been a private man, would have been deemed incapable of the deliberate consent which is

essential to marriage. She early suffered from his violence, though she so far complied with his fancies as to ride with him in male apparel, and even with buckskin breeches—an indecorum for which she was sharply reprehended by her mother, the Princess-Dowager of Wales, in a short interview between them, during a visit which that Princess paid to her brother at Gotha, after an uninterrupted residence of thirty-four years in England. The King had suffered the Russian minister at Copenhagen to treat her with open rudeness. He disgraced his favourite cousin, the Prince of Hesse, for taking her part. He never treated her with common civility, till they were reconciled by Struensee, at that period of overflowing good-nature when that minister obtained the recall from banishment of the ungrateful Rantzau. The evidence against her consisted in a number of circumstances (none of them incapable of an innocent explanation) sworn to by her attendants, who were employed as spies on her conduct. She owned that she was guilty of much imprudence; but in her dying moments she declared to *M. Roques*, pastor of the French church at Zell, that she never had been unfaithful to her husband.\* It is true, that her own signature affixed to a confession was alleged against her. But if General Falkenskiold was rightly informed, (for he has every mark of honest intention), that signature proves nothing but the malice and cruelty of her enemies. Schack, the counsellor sent to interrogate her at Cronenbourg, was received by her with indignation when he spoke to her of connexion with Struensee. When he showed Struensee's confession to her, he artfully intimated that the fallen minister would be subjected to a very cruel death if he was found to have falsely criminated the Queen. 'What!' she exclaimed, 'do you believe that if I was to confirm this declaration, I should save the life of that unfortunate man?' Schack answered by a profound bow. The Queen took a pen, wrote the first syllable of her name, and fainted away. Schack completed the signature, and carried away the fatal document in triumph. Struensee himself, however, had confessed his intercourse to the commissioners. It is said that his confession was obtained by threats of torture, facilitated by some hope of life, and influenced by a knowledge that the proceeding against the Queen could not be carried beyond divorce. But his repeated and deliberate avowals to Dr Munter do not (it must be owned) allow of such an explanation. Scarcely any supposition favourable to this unhappy Princess remains, unless it should be

---

\* Communicated by *M. Roques* to *M. Secretan*, the editor of *Falkenskiold*, on the 7th March 1780. *Falk.* 234.

thought likely, that as Dr Munter's narrative was published under the eye of her oppressors, they might have caused the confessions of Struensee to be inserted in it by their own agents, without the consent, perhaps without the knowledge of Munter, whose subsequent life is so little known, that we cannot determine whether he ever had the means of exposing the falsification. It must be confessed, that internal evidence does not favour this hypothesis; for the passages of the narrative, which contain the avowals of Struensee, have a striking appearance of genuineness. If Caroline betrayed her sufferings to Struensee; if she was led to a dangerous familiarity with a pleasing young man who had rendered essential services to her; if mixt motives of confidence, gratitude, disgust and indignation, at last plunged her into an irretrievable fault; the reasonable and virtuous will reserve their abhorrence for the conspirators, who, for the purposes of their own ambition, punished her infirmity by ruin, endangered the succession to the Crown, and disgraced their country in the eyes of Europe. It is difficult to contain the indignation which naturally arises from the reflection, that at this very time, and with a full knowledge of the fate of the Queen of Denmark, the Royal Marriage Act was passed in England, for the avowed purpose of preventing the only marriages of preference, which a princess at least, has commonly the opportunity of forming. Of a monarch, who thought so much more of the pretended degradation of his brother than of the cruel misfortunes of his sister, less cannot be said than that he must have had more pride than tenderness. Even the capital punishment of Struensee, for such an offence, will be justly condemned by all but English lawyers, who ought to be silenced by the consciousness that the same barbarous disproportion of a penalty to an offence is sanctioned in the like case by their own law.

Caroline Matilda died at Zell about three years after her imprisonment. The last tidings which reached the Princess-Dowager of Wales on her deathbed, was the imprisonment of this ill-fated daughter, which was announced to her in a letter dictated to the King of Denmark by his new masters, and subscribed with his own hand. Two days before her death, though in a state of agony, she herself wrote a letter to the nominal sovereign, exhorting him to be at least indulgent and lenient towards her daughter. After hearing the news from Copenhagen she scarcely swallowed any nourishment. The intelligence was said to have accelerated her death; but the dreadful malady under which she suffered, neither needed the co-operation of sorrow, nor was of a nature to be much affected by it.

We may now return, for a moment, to Falkenskiold, the writer

of these Memoirs, the victim and narrator of the Revolution. He was apprehended at five o'clock in the morning of the 17th of January, by Colonel Eichstedt, who read aloud an order, appointing himself governor of Copenhagen, and a warrant for the apprehension of Falkenskiold, with two other officers. Falkenskiold examined these documents, which, together with the signature purporting to be that of the King, appeared to be written by Eichstedt himself. Remonstrance was, however, vain. He was thrown into a dungeon of ten feet square, in a naval prison, used for the vilest criminals, where he remained seven weeks, without fire, without books, without correspondence or other intercourse with the world. He was refused clean linen and water for washing; he was obliged to carve and eat with his fingers; he was not allowed wine; he was at last deprived of tea, and even tooth-powder, by means of which it was said that he might poison himself. In April he was examined by an inferior commission; and the interrogatories alone are sufficient to show that there never was any colour of a charge against him;—that his whole offence consisted in having served the public, under the administration of Struensee; and that his apprehension, as well as that of most of the others, was for the sole purpose of giving an appearance of reality and strength to the supposed conspiracy, by the numbers who thus seemed to be involved in it. One of the accusations against him was, that when playing at cards, while the King, who was on foot, spoke to him, he made answer without rising from his chair, after the King had particularly desired that none of the party should stand up when addressed by him! He never was tried; but in June it was announced to him, that the King had directed that he should be imprisoned for life. The particulars of his sufferings on the Rock of Munkholm, are related with simplicity and calmness. The memorials of former prisoners, who had preceded him on this rock, served to attest the exactness of the picture drawn by Molesworth, of the cruel administration which had prevailed in Denmark since the establishment of absolute monarchy. Count Griffinfeld, Chancellor of the kingdom in the latter part of the seventeenth century (the very period of which the honest and eloquent Molesworth writes), had, like Struensee, been condemned to death by his successors in office, to justify their conspiracy against him. On the scaffold his punishment was changed into perpetual imprisonment; and he endured the horrors of the most rigorous confinement for nineteen years, at Munkholm, when he died of the stone, which the waters of that place are said to occasion. Falkenskiold was released in 1776, and spent the greater part of his remaining life at



Lausanne, where he enjoyed the friendship of Gibbon, of Tissot the celebrated physician, and of Reverdil, who, as the true author of the enfranchisement of the Danish peasants, deserves a place in the first class of benefactors of the human species. The candour of his narrative, and the temper with which he speaks of his oppressors, give great weight to his testimony, and prove him to have been worthy of the friendship of good men. He relates, without triumph, the retributive justice with which the present king, when admitted into the Council in 1784, marked his entrance into power, by the expulsion of Guldberg, the ringleader in the conspiracy, which branded the character, and shortened the life of his mother—a man, we speak it with regret and shame, of some note as a Danish writer.

What effects were produced by the interference of the British Minister for the Queen—how far the conspirators were influenced by fear of the resentment of King George III.—and in what degree that monarch himself may have acquiesced in the measures finally adopted towards his sister,—are questions which must be answered by the historian from other sources than those from which we reason on the present occasion. The only legal proceeding ever commenced against the Queen, was a suit for divorce, which was in form perfectly regular; for in all Protestant countries but England, the offended party is entitled to release from the bands of marriage by the ordinary tribunals. It is said that two legal questions were then agitated in Denmark, and ‘even occasioned great debates among the Commissioners; 1. Whether the Queen, as a Sovereign, could be legally tried by her subjects; and, 2. Whether, as a foreign Princess, she was amenable to the law of Denmark?’ But it is quite certain on general principles, (assuming that no Danish law had made their Queen a partaker of the sovereign power, or otherwise expressly exempted her from legal responsibility) that, however, high in dignity and honour, she was still a subject, and that, as such, she, as well as every other person wherever born, resident in Denmark, was, during her residence at least, amenable to the laws of that country.

It is certain that there was little probability of hostility from England. Engaged in a contest with the people at home, and dreading the approach of a civil war with America, Lord North was not driven from an inflexible adherence to his pacific system by the partition of Poland itself. An address for the production of the diplomatic correspondence respecting the French conquest, or purchase of Corsica, was moved in the House of Commons on the 17th of November 1768, for the purpose of condemning that unprincipled transaction, and with a view in-

directly to blame the supineness of the English ministers respecting it. The motion was negatived by a majority of 230 to 84, on the same ground as that on which the like motions respecting Naples and Spain were resisted in 1822 and 1823, that such proposals were too little if war was intended, and too much if it was not. The weight of authority, however, did not coincide with the power of numbers. Mr Grenville, the most experienced statesman, and Mr Burke, the man of greatest genius and wisdom in the House, voted in the minority, and argued in support of the motion. Such, said the latter, was the general zeal for the Corsican, that if the ministers would withdraw the proclamation issued by Lord Bute's government, forbidding British subjects to assist the Corsican 'rebels,' (a measure similar to our 'Foreign Enlistment Act'), private individuals would supply the brave insurgents with sufficient means of defence. The young Duke of Devonshire, then at Florence, had sent four hundred pounds to Corsica, and raised two thousand pounds more for the same purpose by a subscription among the English in Italy. \* A Government which looked thus passively at such breaches of the system of Europe on occasions when the national feeling was favourable to a more generous, perhaps a more wise policy, would hardly have been diverted from its course by any indignities or outrages which a foreign government could offer to an individual of however illustrious rank. Little, however, as the likelihood of armed interference by England was, the apprehension of it might have been sufficient to enable the more wary of the Danish conspirators to contain the rage of their most furious accomplices. The ability and spirit displayed by Sir Robert Murray Keith, on behalf of the Queen of Denmark, was soon after rewarded by his promotion to the embassy at Vienna, always one of the highest places in English diplomacy. His vigorous remonstrances in some measure compensated for the timidity of his government, and he powerfully aided the cautious policy of Count Osten, who moderated the passions of his colleagues, though he gave the most specious colour to their acts in his official correspondence with foreign powers.

Contemporary observers of enlarged minds considered these events in Denmark, not so much as they affected individuals, or

---

\* These particulars are not to be found in the printed debate, which copies the account of this discussion given in the Annual Register by Mr Burke, written, like his other abstracts of Parliamentary proceedings, with a brevity and reserve, produced by his situation as one of the most important parties in the argument, and by the severe notions then prevalent on such publications.

were connected with temporary policy, as in the higher light in which they indicated the character of nations, and betrayed the prevalence of dispositions inauspicious to the prospects of mankind. None of the unavowed writings of Mr Burke, and perhaps few of his acknowledged writings, exhibit more visible marks of his hand than the History of Europe in the Annual Register of 1772, which opens with a philosophical and eloquent vindication of the policy which watched over the balance of power, and with a prophetic display of the evils which were to flow from the renunciation of that policy by France and England in suffering the partition of Poland. The little transactions of Denmark, which were despised by many as a petty and obscure intrigue, and affected the majority only as the part of the romance or tragedy of real life, appeared to the philosophical statesman pregnant with melancholy instruction. 'It has,' says he, 'been too hastily and too generally received an opinion with the most eminent writers, and from them too carelessly received by the world, that the Northern nations, at all times and without exception, have been passionate admirers of liberty, and tenacious to an extreme of their rights. A little attention will show, that this opinion ought to be received with many restrictions. Sweden and Denmark have, within little more than a century, given absolute demonstration to the contrary; and the vast nation of the Russes, who overspread so great a part of the North, have, at all times, so long as their name has been known, or their acts remembered by history, been incapable of any other than a despotic government. And notwithstanding the contempt in which we hold the Eastern nations, and the slavish disposition we attribute to them, it may be found, if we make a due allowance for the figurative style and manner of the Orientals, that the official papers, public acts and speeches, at the Courts of Petersburg, Copenhagen and Stockholm, are in as unmanly a strain of servility and adulation as those of the most despotic of the Asiatic governments.'

It was doubtless an error to class Russia with the Scandinavian nations, merely because they were both comprehended within the same parallels of latitude. The Russians differ from them in race, a circumstance always to be considered, though more liable to be exaggerated or underrated, than any other which contributes to determine the character of nations. No Sarmatian people has ever been free. The Russians profess a religion, founded on the blindest submission of the understanding, which is, in their modern modification of it, directed to their temporal sovereign. They were for ages the

slaves of the Tartars; the larger part of their dominions is Asiatic, and they were, till lately, with justice, more regarded as an Eastern than as a Western nation. But the nations of Scandinavia were of that Teutonic race, who were the founders of civil liberty. They early embraced the Reformation, which ought to have taught them the duty of exercising reason freely on every subject. Their spirit has never been broken by a foreign yoke. Writing in the year when despotism was established in Sweden, and its baneful effects so strikingly exhibited in Denmark, Mr Burke may be excused for comparing these then unhappy countries to those vast regions of Asia, which have been the immemorial seat of slavery. The revolution which we have been considering, shows the propriety of the parallel in all its parts. If it only proved that absolute power corrupts the tyrant, there are many too debased to dread it on that account. But it shows him at Copenhagen, as at Ispahan, reduced to personal insignificance, a pageant occasionally exhibited by his ministers, or a tool in their hands, compelled to do whatever suits their purpose, without power to save the life even of a minion, and without security, in cases of extreme violence, for his own. Nothing can more clearly prove, that, under absolute monarchy, good laws, if they could by a miracle be framed, must always prove utterly vain; that civil liberty cannot exist without political liberty; and that the detestable distinction, lately attempted in this country by the advocates of intolerance, between freedom and political power, never can be allowed in practice, without, in the first instance, destroying all securities for good government, and very soon introducing every species of corruption and oppression.

The part of Mr Burke's History which we have quoted, is followed by a memorable passage, which seems, in later times, to have escaped the notice both of his opponents and adherents, and was probably forgotten by himself. After speaking of the final victory of Louis XV. over the French Parliaments, of whom he says, 'that their fate seems to be finally decided,\*' and the few remains of public liberty that were preserved in 'these illustrious bodies are now no more,' he proceeds to general reflection on the condition and prospects of Europe. 'In a word, if we seriously consider the mode of supporting great standing armies, which becomes daily more prevalent,

---

\* They were reestablished four years afterwards. But as this arose, not from the spirit of the nation, but from the advisers of the young King, who had full power to grant or withhold their restoration, the want of foresight is rather apparent than substantial.

‘ it will appear evident, that nothing less than a convulsion that will  
‘ shake the globe to its centre, can ever restore the European nations  
‘ to that liberty by which they were once so much distinguished.  
‘ The Western world was its seat until another more western  
‘ was discovered : and that other will probably be its asylum  
‘ when it is hunted down in every other part of the world.  
‘ Happy it is that the worst of times may have one refuge left  
‘ for humanity.’

This passage is not so much a prophecy of the French Revolution, as a declaration that, without a convulsion as deep and dreadful as that great event, the European nations had no chance of being restored to their ancient dignity and their natural rights. Had it been written after, or at least soon after the events, it might have been blamed as indicating too little indignation against guilt, and compassion for suffering. Even when considered as referring to the events of a distant futurity, it may be charged with a pernicious exaggeration, which seems to extenuate revolutionary horrors by representing them as inevitable, and by laying it down falsely that wisdom and virtue can find no other road to liberty. It would, however, be very unjust to charge such a purpose on Mr Burke, or indeed to impute such a tendency to his desponding anticipations. He certainly appears to have foreseen, that the progress of despotism would at length provoke a general and fearful resistance, the event of which, with a wise scepticism, he does not dare to foretell ; rather, however, as a fond and therefore fearful lover of European liberty, foreboding that she will be driven from her ancient seats, and leave the inhabitants of Europe to be numbered with Asiatic slaves. The fierceness of the struggle he clearly saw, and most distinctly predicts ; for he knew that the most furious passions of human nature would be enlisted on both sides. He does not conclude, from this dreadful prospect, that the chance of liberty ought to be relinquished, rather than expose a country to the probability or possibility of such a contest, but, on the contrary, very intelligibly declares, by the melancholy tone in which he adverts to the expulsion of liberty, that every evil is to be hazarded for her preservation. It would be well if most of his professed adherents would bear in mind, that such is the true doctrine of most of those whom they dread and revile as incendiaries. The friends of freedom only profess that those who have recourse to the only remaining means of preserving or acquiring liberty, are not morally responsible for the evils which may arise in an inevitable combat. The Danish dominions continued to be administered in the name of Christian VII., for the long period of thirty-six years after the deposition of Struensee. The mental incapacity under which he always laboured, was not formally recognised till the

association of his son, now King of Denmark, with him in the Government. He did not cease to breathe till 1808, after a nominal reign of forty-three years, and an animal existence of near sixty. During the latter part of that period, the real rulers of the country were wise and honest men.

Denmark enjoyed a considerable interval of prosperity under the moderate administration of Bernstorff, whose merit in forbearing to join the coalition against France in 1793, is greatly enhanced by his personal abhorrence of the Revolution. His adoption of Reverdil's measures of enfranchisement, sheds the purest glory on his name. The fate of Denmark, after the ambition of Napoleon had penetrated into the North, the iniquity with which she was stripped by Russia of Norway, for adherence to an alliance which Russia had compelled her to join, and as a compensation to Sweden for Finland, of which Sweden had been robbed by Russia, are events too familiarly known to be recounted here. She is now no more than a principality, whose arms are still surmounted by a royal crown. A free and popular government, under the same wise administration, might have arrested many of these calamities, and afforded a new proof, that the attachment of a people to a government in which they have a palpable interest and a direct share, is the most secure foundation of defensive strength.

The political misfortunes of Denmark disprove the commonplace opinion, that all enslaved nations deserve their fate; for the moral and intellectual qualities of the Danes seem to qualify them for the firm and prudent exercise of the privileges of freemen. All those by whom they are well known, commend their courage, honesty, and industry. The information of the laborious classes has made a considerable progress since their enfranchisement. Their literature, like that of the other Northern nations, has generally been dependent on that of Germany, with which country they are closely connected in language and religion. In the last half century, they have made persevering efforts to build up a national literature. The resistance of their fleet in 1801 has been the theme of many Danish poets; but we believe that they have been as unsuccessful in their bold competition with Campbell, as their mariners in their gallant contest with Nelson. A poor and somewhat secluded country, with a small and dispersed population, which has produced Tycho Brahe, one of the greatest names in the history of astronomy, Oehlenschläger one of the first tragic poets of our age, and Thorwaldsen, the most celebrated artist of the Continent, must be owned to have contributed her full contingent to the intellectual greatness of Europe.

ART. IV.—*Narrative of the Surrender of Buonaparte, and of his Residence on Board H. M. S. Bellerophon, with a detail of the Principal Events that occurred in that Ship, between the 24th of May and 8th of August 1815.* By Captain F. L. MAITLAND, C. B. 8vo. pp. 264. London, Colburn, 1826.

THE great and undiminished interest, which every thing connected with Napoleon continues to excite, may be traced, we think, to a higher source than the mere gratification of curiosity. The incessant attempts to blacken his character while living, by every kind of falsehood, showed that those who supposed their employers could be served by defaming him, were not content with exhibiting his failings in the worst light, and exaggerating the crimes, of which, in common with all former conquerors, though in a less degree than any of them, he undoubtedly was guilty. Pure fiction must needs be resorted to; and, after the most ridiculous attempts to depreciate his civil and military fame, he must be made to appear as hateful in private life as, in his public capacity, those traducers were compelled to admit he was formidable. The puny successes of contemporary spite have had their day;—all now admit that Napoleon was the great man of his age, taking the word in its common and most false acceptance—the man by whose name this age will in after times be known;—that as a warrior he ranked before any of his predecessors, and as a lawgiver among the foremost in any age;—and that he will be eclipsed, in all likelihood, by those who follow him, rather in the attributes of self-denial and patriotism, than of genius; a grand superiority, without doubt, and one which, other things being equal or nearly equal, must throw his fame, brilliant as its lustre now is, at once into the shade. Justice being done to his public qualities, it is natural that those, who had been misled by the almost unbounded powers of repeated misrepresentation, should desire to correct their errors respecting his private and personal character. Certain it is, that the more we learn of him, and the nearer we approach him at the most critical moments of his life, the deeper is the impression produced in his favour; and a sense of justice towards his memory, now that he can no longer inflict any injuries upon us, seems to incline most men towards contemplating him in private, as the surest means of obliterating the effects created by deceptions so long practised against his reputation.

The circumstances attending his surrender had been known, in the general, from the period of that remarkable event; but

the details had only been partially given, and with so great an addition of fiction, that it was quite impossible to tell with certainty what had really passed upon the occasion. The publication of the work before us puts an end to all doubt upon this subject, supplying the particulars of this chapter, the last in the history of Napoleon's public life, with the minuteness which was desirable, and under the sanction of the very best authority, the distinguished officer to whom he surrendered himself, and whose conduct, at once firm, judicious, and delicate in an extraordinary degree, while it proves him to have been every way desirous of so great an honour, forms a striking contrast to the demeanour of some others afterwards employed in the custody of the illustrious captive.

Captain Maitland had, immediately after the event, thrown together, in the form of a narrative, the notes and *memoranda* which he made at the moment. Among other reasons for undertaking this task, he candidly mentions one to have been, the desire of correcting 'the many misrepresentations that appeared 'at the time respecting the conduct of Buonaparte,' as well as his own behaviour towards him. He adds, that he has carefully avoided yielding to the bias in Napoleon's favour, which it was impossible even for a British officer not to feel, from his 'fascinating qualities.' This narrative having been shown to several friends, he is now induced, by their very proper advice, to make public. It is written clearly and sensibly, without any pretensions or any affectation, and does him no little credit even as an author; a praise very inferior to that which his conduct, recorded in it, commands for his character as a man, and the promptitude and sagacity with which he performed his official duty.

We shall pass over the detail of the different advices and orders received by Captain Maitland, the communications made by him, and his various arrangements to prevent the Emperor's escape, during the six weeks that elapsed from his arrival on the coast, to the 10th July. He had very precise orders to prevent the escape; and if he should take the Emperor, to bring him 'to the nearest port in England with all possible expedition;' 'transferring him to his own ship,' and 'there keeping him in careful custody.' The possibility of a voluntary surrender seems never to have been contemplated; and Captain Maitland is therefore perfectly entitled to say, that such an event was not provided for by his instructions. On the 10th July, General Savary and Count Las Cases came on board his ship, the *Bellerophon*, with a letter from General Bertrand, stating the Emperor's intention of proceeding to



America, and requesting to be informed whether the British Government would give him a passport, or would obstruct his voyage in a French frigate, or in a neutral vessel. His answer was, that the hostilities prevented any French ship from passing, and that without orders from the Admiral on the station, he could not suffer the Emperor to pass 'in any vessel, under whatever flag.' The following conversation took place between General Savary and the Captain; we give it, because, by our author's most candid statement, it appears that the idea of asking an asylum in England was first suggested by him.

'During the time the Frenchmen were with me, I received some French newspapers from Sir Henry Hotham; but my time was so fully occupied in writing to him, and in discussions with my visitors, that it was not in my power to read them: I therefore drew them back to the subject that had occasioned their visit, and said, "Supposing the British Government should be induced to grant a passport for Buonaparte's going to America, what pledge could he give that he would not return, and put England as well as all Europe to the same expense of blood and treasure that has just been incurred?"

'General Savary made the following reply:—"When the Emperor first abdicated the throne of France, his removal was brought about by a faction, at the head of which was Talleyrand, and the sense of the nation was not consulted; but in the present instance, he has voluntarily resigned the power. The influence he once had over the French people is past; a very considerable change has taken place in their sentiments towards him, since he went to Elba; and he could never regain the power he had over their minds; therefore he would prefer retiring into obscurity, where he might end his days in peace and tranquillity; and, were he solicited to ascend the throne again, he would decline it."

"If this is the case," I said, "why not ask an asylum in England?" He answered, "There are many reasons for his not wishing to reside in England: the climate is too damp and cold; it is too near France; he would be, as it were, in the centre of every change and revolution that might take place there, and would be subject to suspicion; he has been accustomed to consider the English as his most inveterate enemies, and they have been induced to look upon him as a monster, without one of the virtues of a human being." pp. 33—35.

On the 14th, and before the Admiral's answer had arrived, Count Las Cases came again, accompanied by General Lallemand, and stated the Emperor's disposition to go either in a French, an American, or 'even a British ship of war,' as our Government might choose. The Captain's answer was, that he had no authority to make any such arrangement, 'nor did he believe that the Government would consent to it, but that he would venture, on his own responsibility, to receive him into his own ship, and carry him to England'—adding, however, that 'he could enter into no promise as to his reception

' there, as he could not even be sure of meeting with the approbation of the British Government for receiving him.' It may certainly be contended, plausibly enough, that this seemed to imply that the Emperor, if so carried to England, would not be at the absolute disposal of the Government, otherwise what doubt could Captain Maitland have of his conduct being approved by a government which only wanted to obtain uncontrolled dominion over the person of Napoleon? Las Cases, before quitting the Bellerophon, intimated his strong belief that the Emperor would come on board; and from this circumstance, as well as the date of the celebrated Letter to the Prince Regent, the day *before* the interview, it is natural to conclude with our author, that the resolution had been already taken. The Captain, in answer to a question from General Lallemand, whether there was any risk of those who might accompany the Emperor, being given up to the French Government, answered, ' Certainly not—the British Government could never think of doing so, under the circumstances contemplated in the present arrangement.' A project of escape, by being concealed in a cask with air-tubes, on board of a Danish ship, was abandoned, from the apprehension that, should it fail, the attempt might be deemed a forfeiture of the Emperor's claims to good treatment; and Las Cases returned the same day with a letter from Bertrand, referring to the conversation with the Captain in the morning, as had been reported to Napoleon, and announcing the Emperor's determination to come on board early next morning, and receive the passport which he had asked for America. ' Mais au défaut du sauf conduit, il se rendra volontiers en Angleterre, comme simple particulier, pour y jouir de la protection des loix de votre pays.' The letter to the Prince was sent at the same time by General Gourgaud; and to keep unbroken the chain of evidence on which the decision of the question between our Government and the Emperor must depend, we shall here insert it, although familiar to the reader.

" Altesse Royal,

" En butte aux factions qui divisent mon pays et à l'inimitié des plus grandes puissances de l'Europe, J'ai terminé ma carrière politique, et je viens comme Thémistocle m'asseoir sur le foyer du peuple Britannique. Je me mets sous la protection de ses loix, que je réclame de votre Altesse Royal, comme au plus puissant, au plus constant, et au plus généreux de mes Ennemis.

" Rochefort, 13 Juillet, 1815,

Signé, " NAPOLEON."

Captain Maitland read the letter addressed to himself, and

said that he would receive the Emperor on board, and send General Gourgaud on to England—but added that, which relieves himself from all share of blame in the affair, “*Monsieur Las Cases*, you will recollect that I am not authorized to stipulate as to the reception of Buonaparte in England, but that he must consider himself entirely at the disposal of his Royal Highness the Prince Regent.” He answered, “I am perfectly aware of that, and have already acquainted the Emperor with what you said on the subject.” It must be observed, that this declaration and the answer are perfectly consistent with the supposition, that the only question between the parties was, as to the degree of liberty which Napoleon should enjoy in England. In what manner the Frenchmen understood it, is clear from this, that Captain Maitland found them prepared, and in a way which he describes, for an attempt at escaping ‘in the event of Las Cases’s mission to the *Bellerophon* not being successful.’ Now, what does this mean? What could be understood by success, except a reception that would secure the Emperor’s at least remaining in England, whether prisoner or not? How could the mission be less successful than by its terminating in the Emperor’s reception, not only as a prisoner, but a prisoner absolutely at his enemy’s disposal, with respect to the place of his prison, as well as his treatment in it?

At break of day on the 15th, the French brig of war, having the Emperor on board, was seen standing out towards the *Bellerophon*; and Captain Maitland perceiving the *Superb*, with Admiral Hotham’s flag in the offing, and likely to reach him before the brig could, from the failure of the ebb tide, sent his barge to the latter, and brought Napoleon on board the *Bellerophon* a little after six o’clock.

‘On coming on board the *Bellerophon*, he was received without any of the honours generally paid to persons of high rank; the guard was drawn out on the break of the poop, but did not present arms. His Majesty’s Government had merely given directions, in the event of his being captured, for his being removed into any one of his Majesty’s ships that might fall in with him; but no instructions had been given as to the light in which he was to be viewed. As it is not customary, however, on board a British ship of war, to pay any such honours before the colours are hoisted at eight o’clock in the morning; or after sunset, I made the early hour an excuse for withholding them upon this occasion,

‘Buonaparte’s dress was an olive-coloured great coat over a green uniform, with scarlet cape and cuffs, green lapels turned back and edged with scarlet, skirts hooked back with bugle horns embroidered in gold, plain sugar-loaf buttons and gold epaulettes; being the uniform of the *Chasseur à Cheval* of the Imperial Guard. He wore the star, or grand

cross of the Legion of Honour, and the small cross of that order; the Iron-Crown; and the Union, appended to the button-hole of his left lapel. He had on a small cocked hat, with a tri-coloured cockade; plain gold-hilted sword, military boots, and white waistcoat and breeches. The following day he appeared in shoes, with gold buckles, and silk stockings—the dress he always wore afterwards, while with me.

‘On leaving the *Epervier*, he was cheered by her ship’s company as long as the boat was within hearing; and Mr Mott informed me that most of the officers and men had tears in their eyes.

‘General Bertrand came first up the ship’s side, and said to me, “The Emperor is in the boat.” He then ascended, and, when he came on the quarter-deck, pulled off his hat, and, addressing me in a firm tone of voice, said, “I am come to throw myself on the protection of your Prince and laws.” pp. 69—71.

Here we may give Captain Maitland’s general testimony to the unexceptionable demeanour of the Emperor while he continued with him, in circumstances surely quite sufficient to try any man’s equanimity. After mentioning a conversation with Las Cases, which led to giving up the whole cabin to Napoleon, before he came on board, our author alludes to the vile fabrications of some newspapers, who represented him ‘as having taken possession of it in a most brutal way, saying, *Tout ou rien pour moi*;’ and adds this remarkable declaration, ‘I here therefore, once for all, beg to state most distinctly, that from the time of his coming on board my ship, to the period of his quitting her, his conduct was invariably that of a gentleman; and in no one instance do I recollect him to have made use of a rude expression, or to have been guilty of any kind of ill-breeding.’

The Admiral came on board to pay his respects to Napoleon, and was asked by him to dinner, with his suite; for during his stay with Captain Maitland, he was treated as a sovereign, and did the honours of the table as if he had been at home. The Admiral invited him to breakfast with him next morning, and received him with great distinction, manning the yards when he arrived, and allowing Captain Maitland to do the same upon his return to the *Bellerophon*. The Emperor’s manners and conversation, his affability to all, without the least want of dignity, and his quickness and intelligence on every subject, appear to have produced their entire impression in his favour. It has been said by the dealers in slander and falsehood, already referred to, that he laid himself out for courting the goodwill of the crew. Our author’s testimony seems to dispose of that charge.

‘When he returned to the quarter-deck, he questioned the Admiral and myself very minutely, about the clothing and victualling of the sea-

men. It was then, on being told that all that department was under the charge of the purser, he said in a facetious way, "*Je crois que c'est quelquefois chez vous, comme chez nous, le commissaire est un peu coquin.*" "I believe it happens sometimes with you, as it does with us, that the purser is a little of a rogue." This was addressed to the Admiral and me, with whom he was conversing, and not to the people, as has been represented; nor was there a man that could have understood it, as it was spoken in French, and not within their hearing. He asked to see the Chaplain, put a few questions to him as to the number of Catholics and foreigners in the ship, and whether any of them spoke the French language. A Guernsey man was pointed out to him, but he had no conversation with him." pp. 92—93.

The *Bellerophon* arrived in Torbay on the 24th, and Captain Maitland sent a despatch to Lord Keith, giving a detailed account of his proceedings. He clearly must have considered, that he had received the Emperor on board in a way which did not leave the absolute disposal of his person to our Government; otherwise, what possible anxiety could he feel for the opinion to be formed of his conduct? If he had him a prisoner, and at the mercy of his employers, who had only instructed him to intercept Napoleon's escape, and use every means for taking him and bringing him to England, he had evidently done all he was ordered, and effected the utmost that was desired at his hands. If, however, the obtaining possession of his person by voluntary surrender made a difference in Napoleon's claims on our rights, the anxiety of Captain Maitland is easily understood, and no one who reads the following passage in the letter to Lord Keith, can doubt that the writer felt the difference which the manner of the surrender made in the Emperor's situation. After detailing the communications through Las Cases, ending in the proposal to come on board, he says,

"Taking into consideration all the circumstances of the probability of the escape being effected, if the trial was made either in the frigates, or clandestinely in a small vessel, as, had this ship been disabled in action, there was no other with me that could produce any effect on a frigate, and, from the experience I have had in blockading the ports of the bay, knowing the impossibility of preventing small vessels from getting to sea, and looking upon it as of the greatest importance to get possession of the person of Buonaparte; I was induced, without hesitation, to accede to the proposal, as far as taking him on board, and proceeding with him to England; but, at the same time, stating in the most clear and positive terms, that I had no authority to make any sort of stipulation as to the reception he was to meet with.

"I am happy to say, that the measures I have adopted have met with the approbation of Sir Henry Hotham, and will, I trust and hope, receive that of your Lordship, as well as of his Majesty's Government." pp. 104—105.

As soon as the Government was apprised of his arrival, strict orders were despatched to keep him on board the vessel, to watch it most carefully in case of any attempt at an escape, and to cut off all communication with the shore, and with other ships. Four or five of his suite were suffered to remain with him, exclusive of several servants; the rest were to be 'kept under similar restraint on board of other vessels of war;' and finally, 'Napoleon Buonaparte was to be considered and 'addressed as a general officer.' This last point seems all along to have been held in the highest estimation by our rulers and their agents, from the time of the Emperor's surrender, to that of his decease. They appear to have deemed it a grand triumph over their enemy. To us we own it presents itself in a very contemptible light, and merely as a poor spite—a pultry insult over fallen greatness. If any one were disposed to argue the matter seriously, nothing can be more inconsistent and absurd. By what title was he a 'general officer,' we should like to know? By none other than that which made him Consul first, and then Emperor. The magnificent sentence with which his Speech at the Champ de Mai, in 1815 opened, a sentence marked by his peculiar and characteristic style of eloquence not often surpassed—declares his title to all the three ranks—'General,—Consul,—Empereur,—Je dois tout au 'Peuple.' In less rhetorical phrase, he held all his ranks but the first he ever had, Lieutenant of Artillery, from the successive governments which sprang out of the Revolution. He never had received the rank of General from a legitimate king, through his regular minister of war. Why then was he to be called General, any more than Emperor? Why not be consistent and call him Lieutenant Buonaparte, or Mr Buonaparte, at once? He had been recognised as Consul by our Government, and treated as a brother potentate by our Sovereign, whose own title rests upon the self-same ground of the popular voice, which, overthrowing an old established dynasty, placed a new one upon the throne. He had been treated with while Emperor of France, though not acknowledged as such in form; and he had afterwards been solemnly recognised by all the powers as titular Emperor, at least, when he was allowed to retain that rank on being sent to Elba. His subsequent return to France may have given his enemies a right to treat him as a prisoner of war, when he fell into their hands; but when was it ever heard that a sovereign prince lost his rank, (or indeed in civilized ages his personal liberty) by capture? While devising these petty vexations for their illustrious prisoner, it is remarkable that our ministers, (at that time

in the very honey moon of their union with the Holy Allies), carefully kept him from all direct intercourse with the Prince Regent. They seemed apprehensive lest some generous sympathy might influence that exalted personage, whose allegiance to the despots of the Continent was not to be reckoned upon, so surely as their own. Indeed, if we may trust the conjecture of one who knew him well, a favourable impression was very likely to have been made by the Emperor upon his Royal Highness. 'Speaking of his wish for an interview with the 'Prince Regent,' Lord Keith said 'D——n the fellow, if he 'had obtained an interview with his Royal Highness, in half 'an hour they would have been the best friends in England.' pp. 211.

The strict custody in which he was kept, and the constant reports in the newspapers of the intention to confine him in St Helena, must have gradually prepared Napoleon for the resolution which was at length announced to him by one of the Under Secretaries of State, in a written paper delivered to him. He sent for Captain Maitland immediately after, and showed it to him.

'When I had read it, he complained vehemently of his treatment in being sent to St Helena, saying, "The idea of it is perfect horror to me. To be placed for life on an island within the Tropics, at an immense distance from any land, cut off from all communication with the world, and every thing that I hold dear in it!—c'est pis que la cage de fer de Tamerlan. (It is worse than Tamerlane's iron cage.) I would prefer being delivered up to the Bourbons. Among other insults," said he,—"but that is a mere bagatelle, a very secondary consideration,—they style me General! they can have no right to call me General; they may as well call me Archbishop, for I was head of the church, as well as the army. If they do not acknowledge me as Emperor, they ought as First Consul; they have sent Ambassadors to me as such; and your King, in his letters, styled me Brother. Had they confined me in the Tower of London, or one of the fortresses in England, (though not what I had hoped from the generosity of the English people,) I should not have so much cause of complaint; but to banish me to an island within the Tropics! They might as well have signed my death-warrant at once, as it is impossible a man of my habit of body can live long in such a climate."

'He then expressed a desire to write another letter to the Prince Regent; and I carried it the same afternoon to Lord Keith, by whom it was immediately forwarded to London.' pp. 143–145.

'I felt convinced that Buonaparte, after the notification he had received, would be too much depressed in spirits to make his appearance on deck this day; and sent a boat to some of my friends, who were waiting in hopes of seeing him, to say there was no chance of his coming out, as he was much distressed at the communication which had been made to him. I was, therefore, a good deal surprised, on turning round,

to find him standing at my elbow ; and I can only account for his showing himself as usual, by supposing either that he was not in fact so much annoyed as I had believed him to be, or that he was actuated by a desire of creating a feeling of commiseration among the English people in his behalf.

‘ At dinner he conversed as usual ; and, indeed, it was quite astonishing with what elasticity his spirits regained their usual cheerfulness, after such trials and disappointments. He never, in my hearing, threatened to commit suicide ; nor do I believe he did on any occasion : the only expression I ever heard him make use of, that could in any way be construed into such a threat, was, that he would not go to St Helena,—“ Je n’irai pas à St Hélène.”’ pp. 150–151.

Generals Savary and Lallemand being expressly prohibited from accompanying him, were much alarmed at the idea of being delivered up to the French Government, and sharing, of course, the fate of Labedoyere ; for the sacrifice of Marshal Ney was not yet perpetrated. Our author, to quiet their apprehensions, wrote a very strong protest to the Admiralty, and stated, that his own honour was deeply involved in the question. He also declared to Sir H. Bunbury, for the information of the Government, ‘ that he should consider himself dishonoured for ever,’ if, having received them on board of his ship, they should suffer death through his means.

The conduct of Captain Maitland in this matter is deserving of great praise ; but we see no reason to believe that so flagrant an act of perfidy was ever in the contemplation of his employers. He entertained no such apprehension himself, and acted chiefly with a view of satisfying the unfortunate gentlemen, who were alarmed for their own fate, from witnessing that of their master. The protest of the Emperor was delivered to Lord Keith, and was in the following terms.

“ Je proteste solennellement ici, à la face du Ciel et des hommes, contre la violence qui m’est faite, contre la violation de mes droits les plus sacrés, en disposant par la force, de ma personne et de ma liberté. “ Je suis venu librement à bord du Bellerophon ; je ne suis point prisonnier ; je suis l’hôte de l’Angleterre. J’y suis venu à l’instigation même du Capitaine qui a dit avoir des ordres du Gouvernement de me recevoir, et de me conduire en Angleterre avec ma suite, si cela m’étoit agréable. Je me suis présenté de bonne foi pour venir me mettre sous la protection des loix d’Angleterre. Aussitôt assis à bord du Bellerophon, je fus sur le foyer du peuple Britannique. Si le Gouvernement, en donnant des ordres au Capitaine du Bellerophon, de me recevoir ainsi que ma suite, n’a voulu que tendre une embûche, il a forfait à l’honneur et flétri son pavillon. Si cet acte se consommoit, ce seroit en vain que les Anglais voudroient parler à l’Europe de leur loyauté, de leur loix, et de leur liberté. La foi Britannique *sy trouvera perdue dans l’hospitalité du Bellerophon*. J’en appelle à l’histoire ; elle dira qu’un ennemi qui



fit vingt ans la guerre aux peuples Anglois, vint librement, dans son infortune, chercher un asile sous ses loix. Quelle plus éclatante preuve pouvait-il lui donner de son estime et de sa confiance ? Mais comment répondit-on en Angleterre à une telle magnanimité ?—On feignit de tendre une main hospitalière à cet ennemi, et quand il se fut livré de bonne foi, on l'immola.

Signé, NAPOLEON."

"A bord du *Bellerophon*,  
4 Aout, 1815."

He complained also to Captain Maitland in bitter, but not unbecoming terms, of the treatment he had experienced. He recounted the means he certainly possessed of keeping up the contest in France until he could make terms for himself; a large party in the South—the army behind the Loire—the garrison of Rochelle, with 12,000 troops in Rochefort, Bourdeaux, and Isle d'Aix, were all at his disposal; but he saw no prospect of ultimately succeeding in effecting his restoration; and he was resolved not to prolong the war, and desolate France, merely for his personal advantage or convenience as an individual, when he could no longer be said to fight for empire. When he was to remove on board the Northumberland for the voyage, he required to have an order in writing, that it might be seen he only yielded to force; and on this occasion he said—

"Your Government has treated me with much severity, and in a very different way from what I had hoped and expected, from the opinion I had formed of the character of your countrymen. It is true I have always been the enemy of England, but it has ever been an open and declared one; and I paid it the highest compliment it was possible for man to do in throwing myself on the generosity of your Prince: I have not now to learn, that it is not fair to judge of the character of a people by the conduct of their Government." He then went on (alluding to the Government), "They say I made no conditions. Certainly I made no conditions; how could an individual enter into terms with a nation? I wanted nothing of them but hospitality, or, as the ancients would express it, 'air and water.' My only wish was to purchase a small property in England, and end my life there in peace and tranquillity. As for you, Capitaine," (the name by which he always addressed me), "I have no cause of complaint; your conduct to me has been that of a man of honour; but I cannot help feeling the severity of my fate, in having the prospect of passing the remainder of my life on a desert island. But," added he with a strong emphasis, "if your Government give up Savary and Lallemand to the King of France, they will inflict a stain upon the British name that no time can efface." I told him, in that respect, they were under an erroneous impression; that I was convinced it was not the intention of his Majesty's Ministers to deliver them up. "Je l'espère," "I hope so." pp. 187-189.

His emotion upon the subject of Savary and Lallemand, for whose fate he showed more anxiety than for his own, was peculiarly honourable to him. Nor were his parting acknowledgments to Captain Maitland less seemly and dignified.

' Soon after breakfast, Marchand came and said the Emperor wished to see me: I went into the cabin. " I have requested to see you, Captain," said he, " to return you my thanks for your kindness and attention to me whilst I have been on board the *Bellerophon*, and likewise to beg you will convey them to the officers and ship's company you command. My reception in England has been very different from what I expected; but it gives me much satisfaction to assure you, that I feel your conduct to me throughout has been that of a gentleman and a man of honour. He then said, he was desirous of having Mr O'Meara, the surgeon of the *Bellerophon*, to accompany him; and asked my opinion of him in his medical capacity, as well as of his principles. I replied, that I had the highest opinion of him, both for his skill and attention; that he had given me so much satisfaction while under my command, that I had procured his removal from two different ships in which he had served with me previous to my appointment to the *Bellerophon*, that he might accompany me; and that I was convinced he was a man of principle and integrity. After conversing some time longer with him, during which he spoke in the warmest terms of affection of General Bertrand, and the obligations he felt to him for his remaining with him during his adversity, when he knew strong efforts had been used to induce him to abandon him, I took my leave; and this was the last time I was ever alone with him.

' About one o'clock, the barge of the Admiral was prepared; a Captain's guard turned out, and by Lord Keith's direction, as Napoleon crossed the quarter-deck to leave the ship, the guard presented arms, and three ruffles of the drum were beat, being the salute given to a General Officer.

' He walked out of the cabin with a steady, firm step, came up to me, and, taking off his hat, said, " Captain Maitland, I take this last opportunity of once more returning you my thanks for the manner in which you have treated me while on board the *Bellerophon*, and also to request you will convey them to the officers and ship's company you command:" then turning to the Officers, who were standing by me, he added, " Gentlemen, I have requested your Captain to express my gratitude to you for your attention to me, and to those who have followed my fortunes." He then went forward to the gangway; and before he went down the ship's side, bowed two or three times to the ship's company, who were collected in the waist and on the fore-castle; he was followed by the ladies and the French Officers, and lastly by Lord Keith. After the boat had shoved off, and got the distance of about thirty yards from the ship, he stood up, pulled his hat off, and bowed, first to the Officers, and then to the men; and immediately sat down, and entered into conversation with Lord Keith, with as much apparent composure as if he had been only going from one ship to the other to pay a visit.' pp. 202-204.

Our author gives several traits of a very amiable disposition in this celebrated person—as of his kindness to all about him—the liberties he allowed them to take, and the pains he took to soothe them when any hasty expression of his might have ruffled their temper. His affection for his wife and son was strongly marked. “I feel,” (said he, when showing their miniatures one morning), “I feel the conduct of the Allied Sovereigns to be more cruel and unjustifiable towards me in that respect than in any other. Why should they deprive me of the comforts of domestic society, and take from me what must be the dearest objects of affection to every man—my child, and the mother of that child?” On his expressing himself as above, I looked him steadily in the face, to observe whether he showed any emotion: the tears were standing in his eyes, and the whole of his countenance appeared evidently under the influence of a strong feeling of grief. But the general impression which he made upon the Bellerophon's crew is decisive in his favour. It is thus recorded by the Captain.

‘After he had quitted the ship, being desirous to know the feeling of the ship's company towards him, I asked my servant what the people said of him. “Why, Sir,” he answered, “I heard several of them conversing together about him this morning; when one of them observed, ‘Well, they may abuse that man as much as they please, but if the people of England knew him as well we do, they would not hurt a hair of his head;’ in which the others agreed.” This was the more extraordinary, as he never went through the ship's company but once, immediately after his coming on board, when I attended him, and he did not speak to any of the men; merely returning their salute by pulling off his hat; and in consequence of his presence, they suffered many privations, such as not being allowed to see their wives and friends, or to go on shore, having to keep watch in port, &c.; and when he left the ship, the only money he distributed was twenty Napoleons to my steward, fifteen to one of the under-servants, and ten to the cook.’ pp. 223, 224.

Having spoken of the greatness of Napoleon, as all unprejudiced men already feel, and as, before long, all will openly speak, it remains that we guard ourselves, once more, against being supposed to reverence that greatness as the highest which genius can attain. We are using the word in the sense affixed to it by the prevailing disposition of mankind to magnify those qualities which are most hurtful to themselves, and admire, above all other exploits, those which lead to conquest and to power. Napoleon was a conqueror and an absolute ruler; that is sufficient to place him, in the estimation of all who love liberty, and regard the happiness of their fellow-

creatures, on a far lower level than those who have only drawn their swords to defend their country, or destroy her oppressors. But while men shall agree in being dazzled by the brilliancy of vast military genius and prodigious success, regardless of the cause in which the battle is fought, they must place him above all other captains; and he has the same claim to precedence among successful usurpers. He has, however, beside this more vulgar applause, some title to the admiration of the enlightened and humane, very different from those of ordinary heroes. He founded his empire upon the subversion of abuses the most pernicious to the well-being of society.

If he was not a friend of the people for their own sake, he was the enemy of their worst foes. He set his face every where against intolerance; he restrained within narrow bounds the power of the Romish priesthood; he gave no quarter to those antiquated notions which at once intrall and prop up old governments; and wherever he bore sway, the utmost scope was allowed to improvement throughout all the departments of human industry. As a lawgiver, he occupies a high place in the history of modern Europe; and grievously as France paid for his boundless ambition, his thirst of honest fame made some amends, however inadequate, for the evils which his thirst of dominion wrought: The same hand that inflicted the Conscription, bestowed the Codes.

ART. V.—*A Letter addressed to the Peers of Scotland.* By CHARLES LORD KINNAIRD. London, 1826.

THIS spirited, sensible, and well written paper directs the attention of our Scottish Peers to the peculiar hardships of their political situation; and, as it especially points out the manner in which their Parliamentary existence trenches upon the independence of the Supreme Judicature of the realm, we shall take this opportunity of shortly discussing some matters connected with that most important of all questions in the Judicial system of any country, the Independence of its Judges. But, first, we must state the substance of Lord Kinnaird's remarks.

The noble author, we lament to perceive, has formed a very moderate estimate, we will not say of the purity, but certainly of the resistance to ministerial influence which may at any given time be expected from the distinguished body to which

he belongs. Indeed, he takes it quite as a matter of course, that they must elect for their representatives the nominees of the Crown, and without exercising more of their own free will than the Chapter of a Cathedral in the choice of a Bishop. ‘The *Congé d’Elire*,’ says he, ‘being duly issued, and the Government list received and corrected, you are about to assemble,’ &c. We greatly fear, too, that he is by no means singular in his notions upon this subject. A long course of almost unvarying compliance with the known wishes of the ministry for the time being, whether Whig or Tory, has obtained for the elective body a reputation nearly approaching that of a Treasury or Ordnance Borough in respect of steadiness, and for the noble representatives a fame hardly surpassed by the Household troops themselves. If the Peers have sometimes exercised a will of their own in electing one or two of the sixteen, so have we occasionally seen the best regulated boroughs for once oust the nominees of their proprietors; and if, at a memorable crisis, ‘the Thanes fled from’ a minister, it must be recollected that his ministerial days were numbered, as the event proved; and our noble countrymen, with their national gifts of foresight, fell not into the error from which even Oxford herself has not at all times been exempt, that of fixing her regards and bestowing her honours upon a candidate fated to remain for years in opposition.

In the year 1806, we are informed by Lord Kinnaird, the ministers were disposed to introduce a bill into Parliament for placing the Scotch Peers upon the same footing with the Irish. ‘A most liberal proposition,’ says his Lordship,—‘and worthy of the high-minded statesman from whom it proceeded.’ Little, we should imagine, did Lord Grenville expect it to be rejected by the noble personages, for securing whose independence, and increasing their personal weight, it was so manifestly calculated. It seems hardly credible, that they should have preferred remaining in the state in which the Union left them, so greatly inferior to their Irish brethren. For, let us only consider the difference of the two bodies:—The eldest son of a Scotch Peer cannot sit in Parliament for any shire or borough in Scotland; consequently, he is excluded from all chance of being elected where his natural influence lies, and can only make that influence available towards his return, by bartering it with some English or Irish borough-monger; so that the entrance of the most distinguished members of the Scottish community into Parliament is almost of necessity united with the corruptions of the representative system, inasmuch as the return of each individual presupposes two close seats, one

in Scotland, and one elsewhere. From this incapacity, operating at once as an inconvenience to the individual and a stigma upon the body, the Irish Peers are wholly free, their eldest sons being eligible for any city, borough, or county in Ireland. Again, the Scotch Peer, if not chosen to represent the peerage in the House of Lords—that is, if not a friend to the ministry, is excluded from all Parliamentary existence;—he cannot sit in the House of Commons, even for an English or Irish seat. It is obvious how direct the tendency of this incapacity must be to perpetuate the dependence of the body upon the Government; and how grievous it may prove to individuals, or rather how hurtful to the country, by shutting the doors of Parliament against many who were formed to be among its highest ornaments, we need go no further than to the author of this Tract to prove;—for it is one of the most lamentable effects of the injustice which so often bears sway at Court, that his country has, during twenty years, been deprived of Lord Kinnaird's services, only because he had the misfortune to be a Scotch Peer, and the honesty to maintain his principles at the hazard of his Parliamentary existence.

There remains, however, a third particular in which the Scotch is inferior to the Irish Peerage, and it is the most important of the whole;—the latter choose their representatives for life, the former only for the Parliament. Here, then, we have sixteen of the members composing the highest court of justice in the kingdom, who do not hold their places for life, but only at the will of their constituents, that is, practically speaking, at the pleasure of the Crown. That in practice the Peers, not of the legal profession, are seldom called to exercise their judicial functions, forms no answer to the argument. As often as the House of Lords at large acts judicially, we perceive the effects of the dependence of the Scotch Peers. In Lord Melville's case, only one of the sixteen was found to vote for the Impeachment on any one of the articles, although he was upon several acquitted by a narrow majority of the English Peers; and in the Queen's case, where there were a majority of the English and Irish Peers against the scandalous and disgraceful proceeding, only a single Scotch Peer deserted the Court! Among the many inestimable services which Lord Erskine rendered to his country, we may justly reckon the admirable conduct of Lord Melville's trial, by which he removed from the great constitutional remedy of impeachment the objection of endless delay, attached to it ever since the proceedings in Mr Hastings' case, and threatening to make it a dead letter. Restored by this means to vigour, there is now every

probability of its being resorted to in case the conduct of any high officer, either at home or in our foreign settlements, should demand such a course; and as often as the Peers are called to exercise this their highest function, so often must the dependence of one part of their body upon the pleasure of the Crown for their judicial existence, be felt practically in the administration of the law. The effects, too, of this dependence in strengthening the hands of the Government, and frustrating any attempt at bringing a favoured delinquent to justice, may operate to prevent such efforts from being made, and thus secure impunity to transgressions the most generally prejudicial.

The objections raised, most unaccountably, by the Scotch Peers in 1806, and which prevailed to continue their exclusion from the House of Commons, and their dependence in the House of Lords, are triumphantly refuted by Lord Kinnaird. That the Articles of Union are opposed to the change, is certain; but the general clause, reserving to the United Parliament the power to alter these Articles for the benefit of Scotland, has already covered more fundamental changes, though it never was more strictly applicable to any proposed alteration than to the present. The frequency of 'the opportunity to oblige,' occasioned by frequent elections,—in other words, the recurrence of the season for jobbing, has possibly been more felt than stated as an objection to the proposed changes; but it would be unfit to refute seriously an argument which cannot be stated decently. The loss of dignity, which was more openly dwelt upon, our author easily disposes of.

'A prejudice,' says he, 'I know exists in the minds of many Peers, that our dignity would be lowered by condescending to introduce our coroneted heads into the House of Commons. I am no despiser of prejudices—I should say rather of their power and influence, having observed that in general they prevail over the soundest reason—but in this case Noble Lords, I apprehend, have undervalued the basis on which that dignity reposes: they are proud, say they, of their unique situation; the King may make his house steward an Irish Peer, or may turn his apothecary into the British House of Lords, but a Scotch Peer he cannot create. Well, but the power of the King to create ('tis pity his Majesty cannot show mercy by unmaking too) is not a jot augmented, should any Peer descend from his bench to represent English or Irish electors; his peerage (the point of precedence always reserved) is indeed in abeyance, but each is the guardian of his own dignity, and he cannot fear to be sullied by his neighbour's littleness of soul.

'But should the said Peer be disgusted by the fatigues of the Lower House, or should the said House reject him from her bosom, he returns *instantly*, with all his personal immunities, to his dignities.

'But on the subject of dignity, I would fain know the individual opi-

nion of each one of the body I address. It may be convenient to have a seat in Parliament; but, speaking fairly and freely, do you consider that an honour is conferred on you by such an election? I see names on the Government list most becoming the Senate, as they are most honourable and estimable in private life. It is not however less true, that such persons become senators and judges, only because the air of the Court is favourable; and, as the Emperor Paul designated the gentlemen of Russia to be those only to whom he pleased to speak, and so long only as he was pleased to speak to them,—so your Lordships, whose equals the Crown cannot create, must occupy or quit the seat of justice at the Minister's nod. Is not the situation of an Irish Peer more dignified than yours? He is irremovable, and his opinion is uninfluenced by the fear of his elimination when his lease shall expire. In your case, should the mania of public business have unhappily seized you, it requires a most unreasonable quantum of stoical virtue to prefer your opinion to your seat: but what does the Irish Peer fear if he is rejected? He seeks refuge in an English borough, and is cured, or at a crisis, makes his bargain, and gains an hereditary seat by your side.

The subject to which our attention has chiefly been pointed by this tract, is one of the last importance to the community, the Independence of Judges. We have more than once had occasion to touch upon this topic, and to correct the error which prevails as to the period when whatever independence the Judges have was secured to them. But it will be convenient to preface the observations which are now to be offered, by stating the history of this matter.

Before the Revolution 1688, the Judges were not only appointed by the Crown, but held their offices during pleasure, and were in practice removed as suited the purposes of the Government. The instances were numerous in which this prerogative was exercised in such a way as left no doubt that the object was to punish those who had done their duty, and to provide more pliant instruments. Indeed, the interference of the Crown was generally the most distinctly perceived in those great political trials which fixed men's attention in a peculiar manner; and their object in view was as little matter of doubt as the means taken to attain it were shameless. Let us, for example, look to the period in the history of the constitution which Blackstone pitches upon as that of the greatest theoretical perfection, the reign of Charles II., just after the passing of the *Habeas Corpus* Act. He admits that this year (1679) was followed by times of 'great practical oppression;' but it cannot surely be pretended that the very worst of those oppressions, the cause too of all the rest, the judicial murders which were committed by prostituted judges and packed juries, were not the legitimate offspring of the theoretical perfection



whereby the law was administered by creatures of the Court. In 1681 Scroggs was displaced, and succeeded by Pemberton, who was expected to be more obsequious than he proved; for though, in Lord Russell's trial, at which he presided, he ruled every material point against the illustrious accused, and especially 'refused his lawful challenges to the jurors,' and made those 'partial and unjust constructions of the law' of treason, which the Act reversing the attainder reprobates so severely, yet his summing up on the evidence disappointed the insatiable hopes of the King and the Duke of York,—and Burnett asserts his 'being turned out soon after,'—to what he calls his 'stating the whole matter with so little eagerness against Lord Russell,' (History, II. 556.) Previous to the trial of Sidney, a Chief Justice free from all exception was found in the person of Jeffries; and that infamous wretch was well seconded by Puisne Judges, of whom the historian (to paint their character in a word) says that 'they were fit to sit beside him,' (ib. 568.) Pemberton had been once before turned out to make way for Scroggs; and, upon his second dismissal, Burnett observes, that the 'Court would be served by none but by men of a 'thorough-paced obsequiousness,' (ib. 502.) After the trial of the Bishops in the following reign, Powell and Holloway, who had given judgment in their favour, were immediately dismissed. Yet we have no doubt that, if any one in those days had proposed to make the Judges independent of the Crown, he would have been told that those venerable persons were wholly incapable of being influenced by the hopes of Court favour, and knew no other motive than a conscientious wish to discharge the duties of their exalted station. Indeed, some of their successors in our times have seemed unwilling to believe the subserviency which all the history of that period attests. Lord Ellenborough once went out of his way to praise Pemberton's conduct on Russell's trial—not that defect in his perfect obsequiousness which caused his removal, but those directions in point of law which were afterwards stigmatised by Act of Parliament, for which the Statute terms his execution a murder; and Lord Kenyon spoke of the proceeding in a way which plainly showed he had never read, or wholly disapproved of the Statute.\*

---

\* It is possible that those sages of the law (the latter especially) would have paid more respect to the words of a Royal grant than those of an Act of the Legislature in such a case as this. The patent, conferring the Dukedom upon Russell's father in King William's reign, states the desire of their Majesties to record their sense of 'the consummate virtue' of that ornament of his age, whose name could never be forgot so long

Soon after the Revolution, that is in 1692, a bill was brought in to make the patents of the Judges *quumdiu se bene gesserint*. It passed both Houses of Parliament; but the King refused his assent, and it was dropt for a time. The cause of its failure is remarkable, and furnishes the strongest proof of its necessity. ‘Some of the Judges themselves,’ we are informed by Burnett, ‘represented to the King that it was not fit they ‘should be out of all dependance to the Court,’ (*Hist. II.* 86.) The measure was afterwards incorporated with the Act of Settlement, and to take effect upon the limitation of the Crown vesting in the Electress Sophia or her heirs, (12. 13. *Wil.* 3. c. 2.) Like all other commissions from the Crown, those of the Judges expired upon a demise, or six months after; and it remained to secure them from this chance of being removed. A careless expression, and a great omission of Blackstone, who, in enumerating the improvements which the Constitution has received since 1688, says nothing of the important provision of the Act of William, and speaks of the Judges ‘being made completely independent’ by the desire of the late King, has given rise to the prevailing belief that it was he who first made them irremovable. (4. *Com.* 433.) The fact is stated correctly by that learned author in another part of his work, and credit given to the original measure, though far too much praise is bestowed upon the later improvement. (1. *Com.* 269.) We, therefore, the rather cite what is said upon the subject by His late Majesty himself, in the speech recommending the bill. ‘In consequence (says His Majesty) of the act passed in the ‘reign of my late glorious predecessor, King William III., ‘for settling the succession of the Crown in my family, the ‘Commissions of the Judges have been made during their ‘good behaviour; but notwithstanding that wise provision, ‘their offices have determined upon the demise of the Crown, ‘and at the expiration of six months afterwards, in every instance of that nature which has happened.’—‘I look upon ‘the independence and uprightness of the Judges of this land ‘(adds the King), as essential to the impartial administration ‘of Justice; as one of the best securities to the rights and liberties of my loving subjects, and as most conducive to the ‘honour of the Crown; and I come now to recommend this

---

‘as men preserved any esteem for sanctity of manners, greatness of ‘mind, and a love to their country, constant even to death;’ and the new honours are stated to be conferred ‘to excite his son, the heir of ‘such mighty hopes, to emulate and follow the example of his illustrious ‘father.’

‘ interesting object to the consideration of Parliament, in order  
‘ that such further provision may be made for securing the  
‘ Judges in the enjoyment of their offices, during their good be-  
‘ haviour, notwithstanding any such demise, as shall be most  
‘ expedient.’ (*Com. Journ.* 1761.)

Let it not be thought captious if we take leave to dissent from the lavish praises which have been heaped upon this act of the late king. That it was a wise and a beneficial measure, and one which removed a considerable defect in our judicial polity, may safely be admitted; the minister who advised it, the illustrious Chatham, deserves to be held in grateful remembrance, and the Prince whom that minister served, and in whose reign the improvement was effected, might justly have been commended likewise. But to represent it as any sacrifice on the King’s part; as an act of magnanimity, or even as any thing disinterested, is the height of unthinking adulation. The Judges for the time being are quite independent of *the monarch for the time being*, though liable to be removed at his death, provided he cannot displace them in his lifetime. They are not, indeed, so independent of *his successor*; they have a good deal more cause to worship the rising sun, and also to keep well with the ministers who are likely to survive their royal master, or with those whom his heir is likely to employ; and such things have happened as a king not being on the best terms with his heir-apparent. It is, therefore, absurd to pretend that his late Majesty gave up any thing, either of his personal influence, or of the prerogative generally, by acceding to Mr Pitt’s measure. The station of the Judges gained considerably; they were removed from all suspicion of courting an heir apparent’s favour; but neither the king in whose reign the change was made, nor any succeeding monarch, could ever find that his influence over the administration of justice was in the slightest degree affected by it.

There is, however, a defect of a far more serious nature than that which was then remedied; one which does tend to make the Judges dependent on the Crown, leading them to court the favour of the reigning prince; one to remove which, will both purify the administration of justice, and confer upon the sovereign in whose reign the improvement shall be effected, the praise of having both wisely and magnanimously benefited the state; because the reform we allude to, will demand some sacrifice of the Royal influence. As long as the system of translating Judges continues, it is in vain to talk of their independence; and while the law allows their translation, how rarely soever it may happen, we greatly fear, the evils produced by the mere possibility will be felt.

By the law as it now stands, the appointment of all Judges is vested absolutely in the Crown, without interference or controul; and, under our monarchical form of Government, it seems plain that this must always continue to be the mode of creating them. But the necessary tendency of such a power, unavoidably vested in the Crown, is certainly to give the Judges a leaning towards that branch of the constitution. If they have, during their professional lives at the Bar, been looking more or less towards the executive government for promotion to the Bench, their habits of thinking and feeling will have been somewhat influenced by their interest, and they will have acquired a bias towards the side of power in all controversies between the Government and the People; a bias which but too many other circumstances in the education of lawyers tends strongly to confirm. Surely men placed in this situation ought to be carefully divested of all other temptations to seduce them from the rigorous discharge of their high duties; to be kept in such a state of disconnection with the Crown, as may remove even the suspicion of being influenced by its patronage. It should seem that, in some respects, there exists a proper sense of this truth; for, according to a most decorous etiquette of the English Bench, the Judges are not, after their first appointment, to frequent the King's court. Their salaries too have been repeatedly increased, for the avowed purpose of making them independent in their circumstances, and thus enabling them to provide for their families, without looking to the help of the Government. But, with an inconsistency truly remarkable, they are allowed to rise from one station to a higher, in point of rank and emolument and even patronage, and are thus exposed to the strongest temptation, acting the most constantly, and from the influence of which, in giving them a leaning towards the dispensers of patronage, nothing can secure them, save a degree of public virtue far greater than it is reasonable to expect in most men, or than we are authorized, by the general principles of reasoning in matters of national polity, to reckon upon in any class of persons.

Let us for a moment cast our eyes over the details of this subject, in order to perceive the strength of the hold which the Crown actually has upon the Judges of the land. We shall begin with England. Of the three courts of common law, one is so full of business, that its duties are extremely laborious, the King's Bench; the Court of Common Pleas is considerably less so; and the duties of the Puisne Judges, or Barons of the Exchequer, are very light indeed. The salaries of all the Puisne Judges of the three courts being the same, it becomes

an advantage to be removed from the one to the other of the courts; and although, probably from some little emoluments, which afford a compensation for the greater labour of the King's Bench, this is a kind of translation not often looked to, yet there is no doubt that it has been asked and refused. But the promotion of the Puisne Judges to be Chiefs, and of the chiefs in one court to preside in another, is a far more serious evil, and an evil the occurrence of which, it must be admitted, is of increasing frequency. The difference between the emoluments of the puisnes and chiefs, has always been great. When the sale of places in the gift of the two Chief Justices was permitted, they might realize large sums of money by the deaths of the prothonotaries and clerks; they might appoint persons to account for the whole or the greater part of ample salaries; and they had other patronage (and still have), by which members of their families might be provided for; while the other Justices of those courts had four thousand a year, out of which the expenses of two circuits were to be defrayed, the chiefs only going one. Even now, when the salaries of the puisnes are greatly increased, and the emoluments of the chiefs regulated, the Chief Justice of the King's Bench has nearly double of the Puisne Judges, and considerable patronage besides. There is not the same disproportion between the chiefs and the puisnes of the other courts; but the former have, beside the higher dignity, about two thousand a year more in emoluments, and the precedence in choosing circuits, which may at once save trouble and lessen expense. There is the same gradation in dignity and profit among the chiefs themselves; nor is it any answer to the inference plainly arising from hence, that the highest in rank and emolument is incomparably the most laborious, and, even as compared with the puisne judges, the worst paid; for we know by daily experience that men prefer the most troublesome employments, attracted by the splendour of distinction; and that, in choosing between two places, with reference to the profits merely, they do not so much compare their relative duties as their relative emoluments, willing to take that which yields most, without reckoning how much more labour it may demand. As long, therefore, as promotion in each court, and from court to court, is permitted, the desire of each puisne judge must be to reach the place of chief in some court, and of the chiefs, to reach the head each of a higher court.

The last ten or twelve years have assuredly produced more instances of such promotions than the whole of the late King's reign beside—we might almost say the whole period since the accession of the House of Hanover, when the wise and salu-

tary provision in the Act of Settlement came into operation. Since 1812, indeed, it has been the almost invariable practice to choose the chiefs from among the puisnes. What used formerly to be the exception has become the rule, there having been but a single instance of departure from it. One Chief-Justice of the King's Bench has been appointed during this time, three of the Common Pleas, and four Chief Barons; and every one of these eight appointments, save one, has been by promotion from an inferior judicial situation. Equity, too, according to its established maxim, followed the common law in this particular; and for some years it actually happened, that the head of every one of the five ancient Courts, King's Bench, Common Pleas, Exchequer, Chancery, and Rolls, had been translated from an inferior judicial situation. At present, the same is true of all but the Court of Exchequer; and even that is hardly an exception; for the learned and excellent person who presides there, formerly filled the important quasi-judicial place of Master in Chancery. Most of the Chiefs we allude to have been promoted only once; but Sir V. Gibbs went through almost all the gradations; he was a Puisne Judge, Chief Baron, and Chief Justice, within four years, and was in all probability destined to fill a fourth place, had not his health obliged him to retire about the time of that vacancy occurring.

With us in Scotland, the system of judicial promotion, though somewhat differently constructed, is perhaps still more nicely calculated to keep up the same state of constant expectancy, so perilous to public virtue. Our Judges seldom rise to the head of their respective Courts; they do not move from one situation to another which is higher and better; but the process is, to speak in legal language, of a cumulative nature; they add one place to another, never dropping the old mantle when a new one descends upon them, but ascending in the scale of pluralities, till they have as many as three investitures at a time. First the Judge is a Lord of Session; then he becomes a Lord of Justiciary beside; and, lastly, the Lord of Session and Justiciary becomes a Judge of the Jury Court; but there is nothing in our law to prevent him from rising from that third stage through four others, and becoming successively chief of our four High Courts—'being seven stages.' Before he becomes a Lord of Session, indeed, the chances are that he has passed through certain judicial stations of inferior note. Such was for many years the almost invariable practice; of late, the settled order has been more broken in upon.

Let it not be supposed that we offer these remarks with the view of hinting at any invidious matter respecting the vener-

able persons in either part of the Island, who hold those exalted situations in the law. There never, perhaps, was a time when the individuals were more free from suspicion of sinister motives, and when the observations suggested by the natural tendency of the system were so much more of a speculative than a practical cast. For this very reason, the present is the fittest time to urge these observations, when we may freely discuss the thing apart from all scruples of delicacy touching the men.

But neither let us be told of such a regular system of temptations, successively provided for the Judges in all our Courts, being innocuous to their virtue, merely because some men may be found who are proof against its naturally seductive tendency. There were men, no doubt, who dared to do their duty on the Bench, when their sudden degradation might be the first fruits of their integrity. Powell and Holloway made their names justly famous, by a faithful discharge of their duty in the face of the Tyrant, who wreaked his impotent vengeance upon them on the eve of the great consummation by which himself was hurled from his throne. In a former age, Hutton and Croke had given judgment according to their consciences, when every other sage of the law yielded to his fears of Royal displeasure.\* But does any one argue, from such rare instances, that the dread of losing their office had no influence over the Bench at large, when we know that Coke's high spirit, which at first stood out against it, afterwards succumbed, and that Bacon distinctly counselled the King to act upon it in overawing his Judges?† If such fears are admitted to

---

\* It is however remarkable, that both those Judges, in the first instance, joined the other ten, and gave their extrajudicial opinion in favour of Shipmoney; and that Croke had prepared his argument (according to Whitelocke) for supporting the same opinion on the Bench, when his wife, a woman of high spirit, told him—'She would rather live in poverty with him, than occasion him to do any thing against his conscience;'—which gave him courage to avoid the crime he was about to commit. This anecdote sufficiently proves the natural operation of their dependant situation on the minds of Judges in those days. How little the judgment of the majority was misunderstood even by those for whom it was formed, may be gathered from Charles I. always calling Hutton '*The Honest Judge*.'

† 'To be plain with your Majesty,' (says the Attorney-General, after speaking of removing some puisne Judge,) 'I do not think there is any thing a greater *Polychreston, ad multa utile*, to your affaires, than, upon a just and fit occasion, to make some example against the presumption of a Judge in causes that concern your Majesty, whereby

have made the independence of the judicial character a mere name, where the question was between the interests of the Crown and the liberties of the subject, it seems absurd to doubt, that a great practical effect must be produced in the same direction, by the constant operation of hope and expectancy. This is not perhaps so strong a hold as fear; but it is more unceasing in its agency; and it affects spirits which might be found incapable of submitting to the other and baser consideration. In one particular at the present day, it is clearly even more important to secure the Judges from this influence, than it would have been to make their places independent of the Crown. No minister durst have recommended the dismissal of a Judge for his official conduct; but any one may in all safety recommend the promotion of him whose obsequiousness in any inferior station has pointed him out as likely to prove serviceable in a higher place; and the proofs of that obsequiousness may be given far more securely, when the general purpose is to show a fitness for promotion, than if the object were to avoid present removal. If, indeed, the higher station be actually vacant, or held by one in the article of death, no very forward display of political subserviency might be expected, even by the most eager candidates for preferment; because the eyes of men would be pointed to the conduct of the party; but at other seasons, when the public jealousy is asleep, the wakeful selfishness of individuals may have abundant opportunities of displaying judicial qualities so dear to all in high authority, whether princes or their ministers, who have learnt that the true way of governing without restraint and without hazard, is to work through agents willing and able decently to make the laws bend, rather than violently to break them.\* As it is manifest that this is the sort of conduct of these instruments of power from which, in modern times, we have the most to fear, so is that kind of influence chiefly to be guarded against which is best adapted by its nature to convert the Judges into such instruments, and train them to pursue such conduct.

---

‘ the whole body of those Magistrates may be contained in better awe.’  
—(*Cabala*, p. 32.)

\* The irreparable injury done to Charles I. by the too great and open profligacy of his Judges in the case of Shipmoney, has been remarked by Clarendon, who speaks plainly of ‘ the deserved reproach and infamy ‘ that attended them ; ’ and beautifully observes, that ‘ if these men had ‘ preserved the simplicity of their ancestors, in severely and strictly defending the laws, other men had observed the modesty of theirs, in ‘ humbly and dutifully obeying them. ’ —*Hist.* I. 55.



A proposition was some forty years ago submitted to some of the ministers and others in Parliament, as well as the Bench of Bishops, by a most learned and pious prelate, for reforming the Church establishment of England; and one of its principal objects was, to secure the independence of the Episcopal Order. The means suggested were, to equalize the emoluments of the sees, and to prevent translations, if this equality should not of itself remove all desire of change. The plan appears to have been approved of by all the laymen to whom it was communicated, though they questioned the fitness of the time chosen for bringing it forward—as the Duke of Grafton, Lord Shelburne, Lord John Cavendish, and Mr Pitt. Lord Camden said that every line of it was right, but it would take twenty years to ‘bring men’s minds round to it.’—*Anecdotes of Bishop Watson’s Life by Himself*, p. 102. Only one of all the Bishops deigned so much as to acknowledge the receipt of the paper—there seemed to be pollution in the thing; they would not admit having seen it. Their repugnance afforded probably as strong an argument in favour of the measure, as the respectable authority of Lord Camden’s direct approval. Why does every one, upon every question that comes before the House of Lords, reckon upon almost every Bishop being found on the same side in the divisions? One of the most distinguished members of the body shall answer for them. As long as there are steps on the Bench, says Bishop Watson, from twelve hundred a year to five and twenty thousand, those who can climb them only through Court favour, cannot in any sense of the word be called independent of the Crown or its ministers. This is a matter so clear, that nobody ever affects to doubt it; the Bench and the Bedchamber Lords are accounted equally secure; yet if the latter are retained in lasting allegiance by the fear of losing their situations, the hold over the former is the hope of bettering theirs, and is found nearly as strong to bind them. This should indeed be remedied, if the House of Lords is ever to obtain that weight in the country, which can only be conferred by general confidence in the purity and impartiality of its decisions. But it is of incalculably greater importance, that the conduct of the Judges, in the daily administration of their high trust, should be freed from all bias, and removed far above every suspicion.

In what way can the object be best attained, of preventing Judicial translation? Two plans are practicable; a direct legislative prohibition, and a general resolution of the two Houses of Parliament, declaring such promotions to be unconstitutional and inexpedient. The first is, on every account but one, the

preferable method—the last, being only recommended by the possibility which it would afford of making an exception in any rare case of distinguished merit on the Bench, concurring with want of qualification at the Bar, and being liable to objections so numerous and plain that they cannot be specified.

What, then, is the objection to a legislative prohibition? It is said to prevent the choice of men for the highest stations, who have shown their capacity, and acquired experience in subordinate ones. The talent and learning required for both are admitted to be nearly the same, certainly to be of the same kind; and therefore, it is not denied that, in the choice of a *puisne* Judge from the Bar, the risk is run of appointing an insufficient person, as well as in choosing a chief; but the mistake is said to be of less moment, and the inconvenience is pressed upon us of making it impossible to fill the highest and most important judicial station, with the individual whose merits all men may agree have been so displayed as to designate him for it.

An extreme case of this kind, we reply, must always be laid out of view, in canvassing the expediency of a general provision; because, unless the advantages of it in all ordinary cases are considerable, the reason for adopting it fails upon other grounds; and if those every-day advantages are considerable, they more than counterbalance the evil which may result from its operation in some rare, and perhaps fanciful combination of circumstances. But, speaking of the ordinary cases, it is plain, that either the qualifications required in a Chief Judge are the same with those required in a *Puisne*, or they are different; if the same, they can be acquired in the same way, and the harm done during the probationary state is not greater by a Chief than by a *Puisne*; if different, then the Chief is not only learning nothing while a *Puisne*, but he is acquiring habits that rather unfit him for filling the first place. The talents which distinguish a great advocate are not, it is said, those which constitute an eminent Judge; and the illustrious example may be cited of the greatest Judge in our times, Sir William Grant, whose professional fame may be said to date from his elevation to the Bench. It is, however, well known that this was accidental; and that, whensoever that great man had an opportunity of appearing at the Bar, no one excelled him in all that forms the better part of an advocate's qualifications,—close, impressive reasoning—clear statement—readiness and presence of mind. But, after all, how are Judges to be made except from practising lawyers? If the most able advocate would make a bad Chief Justice, then one less distinguish-

ed as an advocate, but known for whatever qualities they may be that constitute a good Puisne Judge, may be chosen for a Chief, even to the exclusion of him who may have risen by other qualifications to the highest offices at the Bar. We suspect that, after all, these distinctions are rather speculative than warranted by experience. It was not by his profound knowledge of law, that Sir W. Grant distinguished himself for a considerable time after his promotion; he was well grounded in its principles, perhaps, and had an eminently legal as well as judicial understanding; but he *became* a ready lawyer, and a distinguished case lawyer, some time after his judicial *birth*. Who, next to Sir William, have been the greatest Chief Justices in the late reign? Lord Mansfield, Lord Kenyon, Lord Alvanley, and Lord Ellenborough,—none of them promoted from being puisne Judges; all taken from the highest places at the Bar, as advocates, and filling those places from their great forensic talents.

It is said that, by preventing all chance of promotion, you damp the exertions of the Judges, who, knowing that they have reached their highest point of elevation, become strangers to the stimulus of hope. Then are we peculiarly unfortunate; for, according to this doctrine, the highest judicial place must always be filled by an indolent and inefficient person, because he feels that he can rise no higher. But a puisne Judge may distinguish himself among his brethren in the eyes of the profession; and this should be a sufficient stimulus, if indeed the satisfaction of well discharging his important duties should not suffice to keep his energies alive.

There is no necessity, after all, for those who maintain the expediency of the provision in question, to show that it can never produce any inconvenience. We might even admit, with perfect safety to the argument, that were there no objections of a paramount importance to such an arrangement, the best way of appointing Judges would be, always to raise those from the Bar who are most likely to make good puisne Judges, and then from among the puisnes, after experience of their merits, to choose the chief. The very worst system has generally some one advantage to boast; and those who oppose too successfully all improvement, seldom fail to single out the exception, and boast of it as a redeeming perfection, which justifies them in retaining the whole bundle of abuses. Lovers of paradox oftentimes fall into the same error, from a fondness for displaying ingenuity, and by showing, that what seems without a defence is not quite so bad as it looks, they become its defenders. Thus, Mr Horne Tooke was wont to say that the Judges had

been the worse for the enactment which secured them their places during life; because, formerly, when they had always the prospect of being reduced to the ranks, they were compelled to good behaviour while in command, that they might have some support when the evil day came. Although it is possible that some controul, though certainly not of the best kind, was thus obtained over their judicial conduct, we presume no one who reasons seriously upon the matter could hesitate in giving this up cheerfully, that, with it, the great evil of constant dependence on the Crown might be got rid of.

It must be admitted, that the great addition which has lately been made to the salaries of the English Judges facilitates the adoption of the provision for which we are contending. The prospect of rising higher than a puisne Judge's place, can no longer be wanting as an inducement to quit the emoluments of the Bar; for five thousand five hundred a year is an ample revenue to a man whose habits of expense cannot but have been moderate, and who must have laid by some money before his promotion. This income, too, he obtains by an exchange of great labour and anxiety, for moderate labour and little if any anxiety at all. Within less than twenty years these salaries have been nearly doubled,—and the depreciation of money and increase of taxes being, at the former augmentations, assigned as the reason, it is remarkable that the last and greatest was made after the restoration of the currency, and the reduction of many taxes had been effected. The manifest expediency of making the remuneration ample for such high functionaries, has reconciled men to this liberal scale. The fitness, no less manifest, of securing their entire independence, recommends the measure of which we have been treating; and the time for adopting it seems naturally enough to be, when their salaries have been put on so liberal a footing.

ART. VI. 1. *Lettres inedites de Madame de Maintenon à la Princesse des Ursins.* 4 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1826. Treuttel et Würtz.

2. *Memoires de M. Le Prince de Montbarey,* 2 Vols. 8vo. Paris, 1826. Treuttel et Würtz.

**I**T is a matter of no small importance, that mankind in general should be well informed of what passes in Courts. It is the common boast of the advocates of pure monarchy, that, however much that form of government may be at variance

with specious theories, it is proved to be tolerable, and even convenient, by that decisive test of Experience which the delusive plausibilities of their opponents cannot stand. This may be, and in part has been shown to be a fallacy, entirely dependent on a double sense of the word experience—which is sometimes used to denote the results of general observation, and at other times to signify some particular facts which may appear to deviate from these results. Wherever the general result is justly stated, and the peculiar appearances accurately observed, it is self-evident that the deviation can only be apparent, and that general and peculiar experience must ultimately be found to coincide. As long as the seeming variance continues, it is safer, both in reasoning and in conduct, wherever we are compelled to make an option, to trust to the general laws of nature, either in the mental or material world, rather than to be guided by insulated phenomena and excepted cases. It is sufficient to make an allowance for these anomalies. If they are considered as objections, no principle of experimental science could be stable; every new and unexplained fact would subvert a theory.

But such answers, however conclusive, are not of a nature to be easily apprehended by the ignorant or the superficial, the indolent or the busy;—which last class comprehends the great majority of mankind. It is very convenient, therefore, that the friends of good government should consent to try the question in dispute by the test which their opponents have chosen; and that *the trial by experience* should be hazarded by them, even in that narrow sense of the word to which their adversaries confine it. They may even restrict it to the very narrowest acceptance in which it is possible to apply it, with advantage, instead of danger to their cause. When we appeal to our constant experience of the effects of liberty or despotism on the numbers, the wealth, the accommodations, the enjoyments, the understanding and the virtue of a community, we are told that men are in all these respects so much affected by other causes, such as soil, and position, and climate, and descent, and religion, (to say nothing of those hidden causes which we call accident), that a reference of the superior advantages enjoyed by any nations, solely or mainly to its form of government, is a procedure not warranted by the rules or examples of cautious and successful philosophy.

But surely the admirers of monarchy will not shrink from trying its merits by the criterion of its effects on Kings and Courts. If absolute monarchy be not a bad government, it is reasonable to expect that absolute monarchs will not in general

prove the most imbecile, or the most depraved of men; that their private favourites should be in some degree objects of reasonable affection; that their political servants should be tolerably capable of public service; that their society should be at least an average sample of the morals and intellect of the well educated classes in the country which they rule. The reasonableness of this test can be disputed only by those who hold it to be possible that a nation may be permanently well governed by weak or wicked men. To this test then let us recur; and for the greater safety, let us receive no evidence against courts, but such as issues from witnesses who are the most deeply interested in upholding their character. Let the character of courts stand or fall by the testimony of courtiers: and let us take it only from their confidential correspondence, or from memoirs which they withheld from their contemporaries. No more favourable treatment of courts can be imagined, than that their merit should be decided by the testimony of those who are best acquainted with them, and most prejudiced in their favour; who condemn themselves by their own evidence; who have the power of suppressing what they think most odious, and of giving their own colouring to the facts which they choose to disclose; and where their suppressions or misrepresentations are secured from detection, generally for a long time, and often for ever. Their confession is spontaneous; if they be condemned, it is out of their own mouths. If they all bear false witness against each other, their malice and falsehood is a still stronger proof of the depravity of their body, than the truth of their relation could have been. If, in confessing their own misdeeds, they believe that they are commemorating their virtues, what shall we think of a society which thus teaches its members to 'glory in their shame,' 'to call good evil, and evil good?' After making every deduction that justice and lenity can dictate, these Memoirs and Correspondence, the best and indeed the only evidence possessed by the world on this subject, must be perfectly decisive of the character of courts; and they will be found to afford the strongest presumption against the possibility of any other than a very popular government, continuing for a considerable time to be tolerably administered.

The grand magazine of proof, is the collection of French memoirs from the latter part of the sixteenth to the end of the eighteenth century. France was the greatest civilized country subject to despotism. The people were in the unnatural condition of intellectual and enlightened slaves. No other nation at once suffered the evils of slavery, and had the talent to record them. The general information of the people reached even the courtiers. The subjection of the press, and the impossibility of

safe publication, drove many to the composition of those Journals and Memoirs, which, after a time, were published to amuse the world, and now serve to instruct it—a remarkable instance of the truth, that the feelings of mankind, if dammed up in the more obvious channels, will always find or force some other outlet. These documents have disenchanted the reign of Louis XIV., which splendid victories and flattering eloquence had surrounded with false glory, and of which the colours were, in the last generation, freshened by the brilliant work of Voltaire. The publication of the Memoirs of the Duc de St Simon, in the year 1788, first materially forwarded this severe but salutary process. That singular man, full of family pride, and an enemy to arbitrary power, a Jansenist (or, as we should now speak, an Evangelical) in religion, and yet the bosom-friend of the Regent, has preserved much from personal observation in the latter part of that reign, and many traditions of its earlier and more glorious period, which are of great value, though they be more strongly coloured by his antipathies than his partialities, and which have a strong hold on the reader, by his incorrect but often animated and picturesque diction. The Letters of the Princess Palatine (Dutchess of Orleans), the niece of the Princess Sophia, to Caroline, afterwards the Queen of George II., have still more torn aside the veil which concealed the depravity of a Court where many disdained to stoop so low as the practice of common and natural vices. In the first edition of this Correspondence, published about the same time with St Simon, the most abominable passages were suppressed. Even in the late republication, there is some reason to believe that sacrifices have been made to decency or to policy; but enough remains, in the nature of the facts related, and in the freedom of the narrative, to place the book on a footing with Suetonius. Nothing but irresistible proof could justify us in imputing to the lowest and most infamous of women, the passages in which this lady, the first Princess of the blood-royal of France, describes the vices of the Duc de Vendome, and the almost prodigious effrontery of the Abbess of Maubuisson, who was her own aunt. The Journal of the Marquis de Dangeau has been published since the Restoration by *Madame de Genlis*, who, however, thought fit to suppress, without notice, about a thousand articles—forming the only instructive part of that equally dull and trifling diary. The suppressed passages, since published by M. Lemontey,\* contribute also not a little to unmask Louis XIV.

---

\* A writer of considerable ability, who, in the reign of Napoleon, long enjoyed a free access to the French archives, for the purposes of his His-

All these books, it is true, like every other *secret history*, require to be read with more than ordinary caution, and with a constant regard to the prejudices of the writer: But taken together, after every due deduction is made, they form a body of evidence which is supported by other trust-worthy writers, where that can be expected—and is seldom at variance with any testimony not tainted by adulation. They sufficiently show, that the Court of Louis XIV. differed more in show than in substance from the society of the Regent and the vulgar rule of Madame Dubarry. Under Louis, the public indeed were less inquisitive, and the Court submitted to somewhat more hypocrisy. The King lived in a perpetual violation of every moral duty. But during his effective reign of fifty-five years, he never ate meat on a fast day, but when ill; and never was absent a single day from mass, but once, on a very long march of his army! \* 'Justice and mercy' were not, it should seem, numbered by him among the weightier matters of the law.' The head fared as ill as the heart. The very stupid person called, with ludicrous adulation, the Great Dauphin, was the pupil of Bossuet, who composed eloquent works for his improvement. But at his education he never read a syllable of print, but the names of dead deaths in the *Paris Gazette*!

Of the two books of which the names are placed at the head of this Article, the first is the genuine production of the principal actor in his Court and councils, during his last thirty years; and the second will afford a short but decisive proof that, in spite of the example of a regular and domestic Prince, Versailles retained its ancient character, till its inhabitants were dispersed by the tempest of the Revolution. For the intermediate period, the excesses of the Regency are well known; and the *Memoirs of Mad. Du Hausset*, the attendant of Mad. de Pompadour, is of itself sufficient to characterize the middle part of the reign of Louis XV.

---

copy of Louis XV. On his recent death, the Government is said to have seized on his work, on pretext that, as it contained extracts from the Archives, it was the property of the State! If this suppression of historical truth has really occurred, and proves finally successful, it will leave the negligent public still at the mercy of Lacrosette, one of the most shallow and slavish of rhetoricians. It will also be peculiarly unfortunate for English History; as M. Lemontey was accustomed to boast that he possessed evidence of a very extraordinary nature respecting the means by which the peace of 1762 was obtained from England.

\* St Simon, I. *Memoires de L'Abbe de Choisy*—a good-humoured and lively writer, perhaps the most amusing of his very amusing class.



The French Court, which was the model of all others, may be taken as a specimen of them. Direct evidence of their moral condition might easily be collected, in every case when their insignificance does not elude inquiry. The general dissolution of manners in Spain and Italy is too well known to leave the least doubt as to the state of their Courts—even if the recent history of Madrid and Naples were less notorious. The coarse licentiousness of the smaller Courts of Germany is exemplified, almost beyond belief, in the life of the first Saxon King of Poland; it is fully displayed in the Memoirs of the Margravine of Bareuth; and would, indeed, be sufficiently attested, if we had no other proof of it, by the contents and style of the correspondence between two German Princesses of such high rank as the Dutchess of Orleans and Queen Caroline.

Before proceeding to Mad. de Maintenon's Letters, it may be convenient to remind our readers of a few particulars of her remarkable history. Frances D'Aubigné, who became so well known as Marquise de Maintenon, was born, in 1635, in the prison of Niort, where her father was confined, seemingly for debt. Her family, though thus impoverished, was that of a respectable country gentleman. Her grandfather, Theodore Agrippa D'Aubigné, was one of the chiefs of the French Protestants, and the historian of the civil wars, by which that ill requited body placed the House of Bourbon on the throne of France. Her first four years were spent in prison; the next six at a little plantation in Martinique, where her unfortunate father died. One of her aunts educated her for some time as a Calvinist;—her mother, a zealous Catholic, by importunity, and at last by severity, extracted from her an abjuration of heresy, to which one of her objections was, that she could not bring herself to believe that her kind aunt would be damned! Scarron, a deformed and distempered buffoon, poor, though of good family, and then known by his parodies and burlesque writings, purely from a generous wish to give her a station in society, offered his hand to her, which the young beauty was compelled thankfully to accept. In this situation, she guarded herself against bold advances, by a parade of austerity;—often in Lent, eating a single salted herring at dinner, and instantly retiring to her chamber. 'The desire,' she afterwards said, 'of making a name was then my passion.' The death of her husband, left her, at twenty-five, in the splendour of her beauty, admired for her talents and manners, and without daily bread. She was surrounded by lovers, of whom one was Barrillon, afterwards ambassador in England. Her passion for a name seems to have supported her; and she obtained a small

pension, as a decayed gentlewoman, from Anne of Austria, at whose death she was once more plunged into hopeless poverty. 'After Scarron's death,' says St Simon, 'she was indeed received in houses of distinction, but not on a footing of equality. She was sent out of the drawing-room, sometimes to order firewood, sometimes to call a carriage, sometimes to ask if dinner was ready, and on a thousand other little errands, which the use of bells has since made needless.' Louis XIV., who had resisted all applications in her favour, was at length persuaded by Mademoiselle de Montespan to grant a pension to Scarron's widow, who, at his command, some time after undertook the education of his children by that lady. In the course of this education, which was at first conducted with mysterious secrecy, Mademoiselle de Montespan sometimes brought her to the King, who conceived a strong prejudice against her, as a *Precieuse*, or as we should now say, a *Blue*. The natural good sense of that Prince concurred with his extreme ignorance, in disposing him to dread women of superior attainments, which were then seldom unattended with pedantry. But she gradually softened his dislike by quiet and submission;—she stole with patient and wary steps imperceptibly into his good opinion;—he unconsciously began to take refuge in her sensible conversation and modest demeanour from his haughty and capricious mistress, who was first displeased, then made jealous, and at length incensed by the growing favour of her humble friend, while she disgusted him by furious eruptions of jealousy, and contributed to the advancement of her new rival by every fresh insult. Such were the prudence and moderation of Madame de Maintenon, that she ingratiated herself at the same time with the Queen, who died in her arms in July 1683. Her exertions to reclaim the King from his habitual vices, which were probably well intended, and proceeded from a sincere regard to his welfare, by a singular fortune contributed to the ruin of her rival, and to her own extraordinary elevation. Religion estranged the King from the mistress; and she who converted him became gradually the object of a grateful and tender friendship. Agitated by remorse, and flying from licentious love, he sought an aid to his penitence, and a substitute for his decaying passions, in a calmer and more pure affection for his instructress.\* Her ambition was then awakened. 'At forty-five,' says she to a correspondent, 'a woman can no longer inspire love. But he gives me the fairest hopes. I send him away always in sorrow, but

---

\* *Memoire de Choisy.*

‘ never in despair.’ At length, after many struggles, the proudest monarch in Europe, in the year 1685, secretly married the widow of a buffoon, born in beggary, to whom he had a few years before refused alms, when he was in the forty-seventh, and she in the fiftieth year of her age !

Though her life was a romance, her character was prosaic. It cannot, indeed, be supposed that she was not a most uncommon woman. But her superiority consisted, not in rare qualities, but in the possession of a high degree of those which are common to the majority of sensible persons. Manners, temper, judgment, consideration, aided by a singular concurrence of favourable circumstances, were the means of an elevation little less remarkable than that to which a very few men have risen, by the combination of original genius with energetic character. Her general conduct is an excellent exemplification of that which, according to the various prepossessions of mankind, is called the selfish, or the prudential, or the rational system of morals. She seems more uniformly to have regulated her choice by the distinct and deliberate consideration of the influence of her actions on her general well-being, than almost any other person whose character is so well known to us. Had she confined her views, in the application of this principle, to the lower and grosser interests of life, she would have been a very unfair specimen of her class, against whom all reasonable followers of the like maxims would justly protest as disqualified to be their representative. But she must be allowed to have comprehended every object which can be brought within the scope of the most enlarged and enlightened prudence. She set a just, and therefore the highest value on a good name, on the cultivation of the understanding, the moderation of the desires, and on the government of the temper, on the peace of mind, on the approbation of conscience, on the prevalence of that benevolence which constantly cheers and sweetens the mind. Her religious principles, though merely prudential, were sincere. They consisted in the same regard to her own ultimate interest, which ruled every part of her nature. Her cool judgment taught her to seek every means of avoiding the disquiet and disgrace which, in the end, are the usual consequence of participation in acts of baseness or cruelty. Her mind was neither elevated by enthusiasm, nor disturbed by passion, nor melted by tenderness. She performed no acts of hazardous virtue, and knew the art of skilfully and decently releasing herself from inconvenient friendships. She did not perhaps betray her benefactress Mad. de Montespan, but she willingly profited by the excesses of that favourite, and quietly took her

place. It is too much to affirm that she prompted the persecution of her former fellow-religionists. But it is certain that she did not ruffle the temper of her Royal lover, by persevering remonstrance against that cruel persecution. 'The King,' she writes to a correspondent, 'has been told that I was a Calvinist. *This induces me to approve measures most opposite to my sentiments.*' In writing to her profligate brother in 1681, she tells him 'You cannot employ the money you receive better 'than in the purchase of an estate in Poitou. *They are to be had there for nothing, in consequence of the flight of the Hugonots!*' She did not venture to protect Racine against the unjust and mean resentment of the King, though it was incurred by a paper on the general distress written at her desire. The exile of Fenelon was continued during the period of her greatest power. Regards for herself prevailed, even in the last moments of the King's life. She continued her attendance on him, only as long as it was useful to him and safe to herself. Neither compassion nor gratitude betrayed her into an advance of a hairbreadth beyond these strictly calculated boundaries. On the 30th of August 1715, when the King became insensible, she immediately took refuge at St Cyr from the dreaded resentment of the populace; and it was not till two days after, that she learnt in that retirement the tidings of his death. She reaped the fruit of her character and system. She crept up from the lowest to the highest condition in society. She accumulated all the outward means of human enjoyment. According to the estimate of the world, she was the most prosperous of women. But her own descriptions betray the difference between prosperity and happiness. In looking into a fish-pond at Marly, she said to her friend, 'You see how languid the carp are. They 'are like me, they regret their mud!'—'What a punishment,' she often bitterly exclaimed, 'it is to have to amuse a man who 'is no longer amusable!'

St Simon's description of the manner in which she exercised her ascendant, however tinctured by his hostile feelings, is too precious not to be presented to the reader, with a few retrenchments in the superfluities, but with no abridgement of the characteristic parts. It is a picture evidently taken from the life.

'On the days of business, Mad. de Maintenon, in whose apartment the ministers transacted affairs with the King, sat by, reading or working tapestry. She quietly heard all that passed, and 'rarely threw in a word. The word was still more rarely of 'any consequence. The King often asked her advice, addressing her in a playful tone, as *your solidity, or your reasonableness*. She answered slowly and coldly, scarcely ever betray-

‘ing a prepossession for any thing, and never for any person; but the ministers had their cue. If by chance the King at first fixed on her candidate, it was well, the ministers were sure to agree; and they contrived to hinder the mention of any other. If he showed a preference for any other, the minister read out his own list, rarely recommending any one directly, but hinting at the objections to all, so as to leave the King perplexed. In this embarrassment, he often asked the advice of the minister, who, after again balancing the good and bad qualities of all, showed a slight preference for one. The King hesitated, and frequently in that stage referred to Mad. de Maintenon. She smiled, affected to be incapable of judging, said something in favour of another candidate, but at last, sometimes slowly, as if deliberating, sometimes as if by a sudden, accidental recollection, returned to the candidate whom she had prompted the minister to recommend; and in this manner she disposed of all favours and preferments in France.’

She appointed, removed, preferred or disgraced ministers. They consulted her pleasure in every thing. Sometimes when matters were not managed with sufficient address and artifice, the King was liable to sudden explosions of independence. When a minister or a general too openly favoured one of her relations, the Monarch resisted, and boasted of his spirit. ‘Such a one,’ he would say, ‘is a good courtier. It is not his fault that all Madame’s relations are not preferred.’ These occasional strokes more and more taught her to be reserved and wary. Her constant answer to applications was, that she never meddled with politics. Half a dozen of her oldest friends were a creditable exception. On their behalf she prevailed over her own cowardice and selfishness, and generally succeeded in conquering the King’s affectation of independence. On such occasions, warm scenes sometimes passed between them; she wept in his presence, and she was on thorns for some days. These mutinous dispositions had been shown by Louis to some of his former managers. Letellier, before he was chancellor, on the application of one of his best friends for a favour, answered, that he would do what he could. His friend murmured at what he thought a cold answer. ‘You do not know the ground,’ replied the minister. ‘Our recommendations prevail nineteen times in twenty. We know that we shall fail but once in twenty times. But we never know which recommendation is to fail. It is often that in which we are most desirous of success. If the case be of great importance, we risk a quarrel. We show ourselves as obstinate as the King. We face the storm; and he, relieved by venting his anger, becomes more yielding than before.’

Thus, he who was the terror of Europe, and who seemed to be the absolute master of France, was converted into a puppet moved by an old woman; and while he, in the fancied exercise of an unfettered will, issued his commands to obedient millions, the aged sorceress sat in silence and apparent humility beside him, guiding, by unseen springs, every movement of his hand and articulation of his voice, according to her pleasure. It is hard to believe that she and her creatures did not sometimes smile, at least secretly, at the timid hints, the mock discussions, the hypocritical reverence, which were the potent incantations by which these political magicians transformed their masters into a slave. When he had set himself free from all outward restraints, he was the more sure of having his mind enslaved. He was disturbed by no representative assembly. He had silenced even the judicial bodies who, before and after him, had manifested a noble independence. The word People, no man in his dominions would have dared to utter. ‘The State,’ he said, ‘is myself.\*’ Dungeons were every where prepared for the writers who could be so insane as to breathe a syllable of censure on his measures. He was not checked by the counsel of an honest minister. But having thus escaped the control of parliaments and tribunals, of a public and a press, of courageous counsellors, or an independent nobility, he fell into the toils of a Favourite. For it is a vain attempt in the greatest of human beings to rule a nation without aid. If such an attempt were in itself practicable, the very possession of absolute authority would soon weaken the mind of the possessor too much to make it long possible for him; and the power of using him as an instrument for governing an empire, is too great a prize not to call forth a combination of talent to enslave him, more than sufficient to overpower his enfeebled spirit. When he attempts to escape the appointed lot of despots, his choice of men and measures becomes the worse for his independence. He is then, as we learn from the veteran courtier, *Letellier*, influenced by motives so petty or capricious, that those who know him best cannot foresee his determination. Either his caprice is nearly the same as chance, or he exchanges the ascendant of ministers and mistresses, who generally have some ability, and may often have some fear of infamy, for that of minions, who being unknown, are shameless and fearless, and who rarely have any other talent than the mean faculty of gaining favour.

---

\* A declaration applauded in the year 1826 by the *Abbé La Menais*, the eloquent advocate of the Jesuitical system.

The chain of power did not end in Madame de Maintenon. She, indeed, ruled the Sovereign of France; but she was herself ruled by an humbler favourite. Nanon *Balbieux*, or *Babbieux* (the various orthography of her name in different writers is indicative of her origin and her education), had long been her only servant, and after the death of Scarron was accustomed to make their joint bed, and to dress their plate of soup, in the little bedroom which was their only dwelling. It is one of the most honourable facts in the history of Mad. de Maintenon, that this faithful servant followed her through all her changes of fortune. With the boundless prodigality which is more often practised to a favourite than to a friend, Madame de Maintenon at last bestowed on her the office of Superintendent of the almost Royal Household, and she ended by dictating as many promotions as she desired. Such is the ascendancy of inferior attendants, to which long habit, constant access, and the skilful use of favourable moments, so generally subject the great; or, if we look at man from another point of view, so urgent is the need which compels the coldest natures to seek, in the pleasure of feeling attachment and of seeming to inspire it, some amends for a life of joyless selfishness and painful hypocrisy.

The present publication consists of a Correspondence of Mad. de Maintenon with the Princess Ursini, or, as she was called in France, Des Ursins; a French lady who had married two husbands of the noble houses of Talleyrand and Ursini, and who was sent in her second widowhood to Madrid, to govern Philip, through the young Princess of Savoy his first Queen. The letters are correct, cold, wary, unbending; the production of a woman who never dared to express the little feeling she had, and was too sensible to make a display of talent in her correspondence. Whoever is desirous of reading letters of natural effusion, graceful ease, and sometimes agreeable negligence, occasionally lighted up by happy phrases, struck out by feeling and taste, must look elsewhere for these epistolary graces. The old politician in petticoats had her caution too constantly on the stretch to indulge herself in such elegant relaxation. The subjects are either court news, which never could have interested *any* but court ladies, or remarks on political events, which have long ceased to interest the general reader. But in spite of the stiff and wary writer, the former part contains some strokes of character and manners, and the latter contributes some materials for the history of the war and the peace. A few extracts may please many who would not have patience to read the book. We shall select, in the first

place, those which relate to Warfare and Negotiations. They begin immediately after the great battle of Ramillies.

20th June 1706.—‘ The designs of God are impenetrable. Three great and most Christian Kings appear to be abandoned. ’—One of these three was the unfortunate son of James II.)—‘ *Heresy and injustice triumph.* ’—‘ Villeroy is full of bitterness and despair. ’

16th April 1707.—‘ I am overjoyed that eighty Spaniards have beaten five hundred English. I naturally love the Spaniards, and the lowest of the populace cannot at present hate the English more than I do. ’

4th March 1708.—‘ The King of England is to set out on the 9th, and to embark at Dunkirk for Scotland on the 10th. The King gives him six thousand men. The Scotch lads have written repeatedly that they will receive him. If God blesses this enterprise, it will make a great division, and perhaps peace. If you have any saunts in Spain, let them pray for its success. I went to St Germain yesterday. The Queen is in a wretched state. She has gout, some fever, and a cold in the head, besides her agitation of mind. ’

25th March 1708.—‘ The expedition to Scotland interests all the world. Every one here was full of consternation at the delay, and are rejoiced at the King of England’s sailing. ’

4th April 1708.—‘ We have just had accounts of the failure of the Scotch expedition. ’

15th April 1708.—‘ I am the only person of the Court who has not been at St Germain to condole with the Queen. You know her courage ; but she cannot speak a word without sighing. ’

25th April 1708.—‘ I have had a fever, which *Fagon* calls the Scotch fever.—No enterprise was so much applauded as that against Scotland, except (I tell you in confidence) by the King, who always had a bad opinion of it, and yielded only to the universal cry. The King of England had the measles, which detained him ten days at Dunkirk. The wind changed an hour after he set sail, which kept him twenty-four hours off Ostend. He mistook the entrance of the Frith of Edinburgh, and nothing but the ability and good fortune of Forbin saved the fleet. ’

28th April 1708.—‘ An officer of one of our smaller ships of war landed in Scotland, and was told by some Highland gentlemen that they would always be ready to receive the King. Mareschal de Matignon was appointed to command the troops, not for his own merit, but from the objections to others. ’

8th June 1708.—‘ Our great want is money. ’

September and October 1708.—A deep gloom covers every thing, relieved only by the gallant defence of Lisle by the Mareschal de Boufflers. The Duke of Burgundy was sent to take the nominal command of the army, with instructions to follow the advice of the Duke of Berwick. Vendome was also sent. These two Generals were of opposite character, and jealous of each other’s almost equal pretensions. Vendome was one of the boldest, and Berwick was one of the most cautious of able commanders. The inexperience and timidity of the Duke of



Burgundy, and his disgust at the moral character of Vendome, disposed him, as well as his instructions, to prefer the counsel of Berwick, which was in all probability the wisest. Vendome was confident, negligent, and regardless of discipline; but Berwick was sent to command on the Upper Rhine.'

23d November 1708.—'The general cry ascribes the failure of the campaign to the Duke of Burgundy. The libertines dislike his severe manners, the Jansenists object to his Jesuit confessor. It is said that those who dread the re-appearance of the Archbishop of Cambrai at Court, represent his pupil to be as pacific as Telemachus, and to have been pleased with the surrender of Lisle, both because it would tend to peace, and because it was acquired by an unjust war.'

9th December 1708.—'The Duke of Burgundy needs all his spirit to bear the unjust invectives of the world.'

23d December 1708.—'You are right in considering all as coming from God. Our King was too glorious, and was to be humbled in order to be saved! France had spread too far and perhaps unjustly. She was to be confined within narrow, but perhaps more safe limits. Our nation was insolent and disorderly. God determined to chastise them.' 'But,' she adds, with exemplary modesty, 'I confess *I do not see so clearly* the cause of your misfortunes in Spain.'

27th January 1709.—'Distress as well as alarm has reached its height at Paris.'

17th February 1709.—'Our enemies triumph every where. We have only to bow our heads under the hand of God, which seems heavy against us, and to support *heresy and injustice against the nations who serve him best*. Yet he is just!'

18th March 1709.—'It is now the general opinion at Court that M. de Vendome has nothing but boldness and boasting. M. de Boufflers said the other day, that an army was not to be commanded from a night chair—the usual seat of Vendome. The Abbé Alberoni is his private companion at Anet.'

29th April 1709.—'Torcy is gone to Holland to try to make peace.'

10th June 1709.—'Our greatest enemy is famine. Every thing is to be dreaded from a people dying of hunger, who believe that the King secretly buys up corn in order to sell it with a profit.'

17th June 1709.—'You are angry at our concessions. Yet they did not satisfy the enemy; and the negotiation is broken off.'

14th July 1709.—'You condemn us for being willing to submit to the hard terms offered to us. But every Frenchman wishes it. Boufflers, Villeroy, and Harcourt, are of that opinion.'

5th August 1709.—'You are *too good a Frenchman to wish to see France destroyed for the sake of saving Spain*. Perhaps we may be *obliged to make peace on worse conditions than those which we refused*.'

14th September 1709, (three days after the battle of Malplaquet).—'M. de Boufflers calls the battle glorious and unfortunate. We are on the eve of wanting seed. God declares against us so visibly, that it would be resistance to him not to desire peace.'

29th September 1709.—‘ I make allowance for your attachment to their Catholic Majesties. *But would you ruin France, and see the English at Paris?* There are no longer two opinions on the subject. M. de Villars, with all his boldness, thinks about peace as I, with all my fears, do.’

20th October 1709.—‘ Nobody doubts here that the Spaniards will abandon the Archduke, when they see the King abandoned by France.’

3d February 1710.—‘ All Paris are reduced to pray most fervently for any peace however cruel.’

2d March 1710.—‘ I hope you will not blame me for dreading the loss of France more than that of Spain.’

24th March 1710.—‘ The affairs of Spain are thought so desperate, that nobody can be prevailed upon to go there as physician to the Royal family.’

29th June 1710.—‘ *God grant that so good a Prince and such affectionate subjects as those of Spain may not be separated; but it is impossible to see how that work can be accomplished.*’

10th November 1710.—‘ God grant their Catholic Majesties may make a peace which will leave them something; *but to imagine that the enemy will leave Spain to a French Prince, is an idea that appears here quite chimerical.*’

So utterly did the Court of Spain despair of maintaining a Bourbon on the throne of Spain at the moment of the fall of the Whig administration, and the accession of the Tories to power in England! It is evident that, up to that moment, they were ready to consent to conditions of peace which might be agreeable to the original principle of the grand alliance. But, as soon as it was found that the new ministers of England were resolved to make peace without much regard to the terms, in order to smooth the way for a counter revolution, a very different spirit arose at Versailles, which soon manifests itself in the language of Mad. de Maintenon to her correspondent.

12th January 1711.—‘ *The intrigues in England augment daily. There is really a movement visible there, from which it is thought that we shall profit!*’

11th October 1711.—‘ *I can consider no peace as disadvantageous which will establish Philip V. on his Throne.* Whatever it may cost to us or to others, it is greatness enough for our King to have got the Spanish monarchy for his family, in spite of all Europe armed against him? *Many believe that if peace be made the King of England will be restored.* The Princess Anne is threatened with a dropsy. *It would be a great disadvantage to us if she were to die now?*’

19th November 1711.—‘ Their Catholic Majesties will remain on the throne. I always hoped in the time of my greatest despair, that this might have been effected by a miracle. Pensionary Heinsius will hang himself for having refused the dreadful peace which we should have probably submitted to two years ago. But I have no charity for him. *All my tenderness is now for Queen Anne,*’ (for so Madame de Maintenon

now, for the first time, calls her instead of Princess Anne, the title by which she designs her in the former part of the Correspondence, influenced either by the warmth of her friendship for the Court of St Germain, or by a royal adherence to the diplomatic style of the French government, in which Anne was never treated as Queen till the preliminaries of peace).

22d November 1711.—‘ I do not care whether we owe the peace to the death of the Emperor, or to the divisions in England.’

30th November 1711.—‘ *Old as I am, I still hope we shall see the King of England return to his kingdom.* What a glory for our King to have maintained a war for ten years against all Europe, attended among other misfortunes with a famine and with a plague, which carried away millions of his subjects, if it finishes by a peace which secures Spain to his family, and reestablishes a Catholic King in England, which I can hardly doubt will be the effect of the peace!’

25th January 1712.—‘ The Queen of England’ (no longer Princess Anne) ‘ has recovered her health.’

7th February 1712.—‘ The news from England are good. Queen Anne has received Prince Eugene coldly.’

30th May 1712.—‘ Why do you call the King of England always unfortunate? *I see many people who think that he will be restored.*’

Every reader is aware that the King of Spain, by the treaty of Utrecht, renounced his claim to the succession of the Crown of France, and that this renunciation was represented by the ministers in England, as a sufficient security against the union of the two kingdoms. That it was treated at Versailles as a solemn farce, requiring only to be well acted, is apparent from the following confidential passages.

18th July 1712.—‘ I do not speak of *the renunciation*; for I think nothing more *imprudent* than to hold the language on it that is used here. *I think of it as others do.* There are not two opinions on the subject, from the palace to the market-place.’

12th August 1712.—‘ Queen Anne sends Lord Bolingbroke, who brings with him Prior and Gautier.’

27th November 1712.—‘ I am very impatient to learn that the Duke of Hamilton is here. As for seeing him, I have no thoughts of it. My doors are more than ever shut on all the French. I cannot be expected to receive foreigners.’

12th May 1713.—‘ I often think of the miracle which God has worked in favour of our Kings, and of the difference of the peace we have just signed from that proposed at Gertruydenberg.’

31st May 1713.—‘ The Chevalier de St George is charmed with his reception at the Court of Lorrain. *We must see him reinstated.*’

14th August 1714.—‘ At length Queen Anne is dead. In an interval between two fits of apoplexy, she had her senses so far as to sign every thing most adverse to her brother. That Prince wished to set out as soon as he had heard the accident, and our Queen of England had the courage to assent to his plan; but as soon as we heard what had passed

about the Duke of Hanover, he was prevented from exposing himself to certain danger.'

15th November 1714.—'The Duke of Lorraine is generous enough to redouble his attentions to the King of England, in proportion to that Prince's misfortunes.'

25th December 1712.—'I see with pleasure the discord between the Whigs and Tories, which will secure our peace. It is said that the new King of England is disgusted with his subjects, and that his subjects are disgusted with him. May God reestablish a better order!'

Madame des Ursins was extremely displeased at the disposition shown at Versailles to purchase peace from the English Whigs and Dutch Republicans, by the sacrifice of Philip V. She agreed also with her correspondent in her hopes of the restoration of the Stuarts, and her disappointment at the failure of the Tories, in their grand purpose of excluding the House of Hanover. A very few extracts from her Letters will be sufficient.

25th October 1711.—'It is not in France only that the Princess Anne is thought well disposed to the King her brother. What exceeding joy we should feel if the virtuous Queen and the King her son were to return triumphant to London!'

17th August 1714.—'I feel the greatest alarm at the health of Queen Anne. The disunion between Lords Oxford and Bolingbroke may be destructive to both.'

22d September 1714.—'Is it possible that Lord Oxford, so much esteemed for his capacity, should have been wanting in fidelity?'—'I hear nothing but good of Lord Bolingbroke. Whatever may befall him, *he has chosen the better part—that of doing what he ought.*'

27th October 1714.—'I hear that every thing in England is preparing to destroy what Queen Anne did, and that the Whigs breathe nothing but war.'

But the tone of the next extract from the Letters of this lady, with which we shall close, is a curious instance of the power of a small civility in softening the sternness of a female politician.

8th December 1714.—'I had the honour of knowing the new King of England at Rome, where he did me the honour to visit me with his father. He has sent me a message of complimentary remembrance.'

A few paragraphs respecting the unfortunate Royal family at St Germain's, will be acceptable to those who feel more interest in fallen than in flourishing Courts. 'Sweet are the uses of adversity;' and among them there are few more observable than the power which it possesses of investing its victims with dignity, even where it does not teach them virtue, and of bestowing a command over our feelings, on persons who, if they

had been prosperous, would have been unnoticed by all but those who could turn them to account.

27th September 1707.—‘ Fontainebleau. The Court of England is here. The Queen is extremely depressed. The King is desirous of going to the army. He is full of piety. The Princess is tall and well made : more animated than her brother, and transported with joy at being at Fontainebleau.’

16th October 1707.—‘ The Court of England once more gives the appearance of a Court to this place. Fifty ladies, magnificently dressed, appear every day. We had eighty-two carriages in our last drive. The Princess has succeeded very well. She is gay and clever.’

17th November 1707.—‘ Notwithstanding the popularity of the Princess of England, our politicians pretend that she must not be thought of for the Duke de Berry ; for she might easily become Queen of England, and her pretensions would become a source of perpetual wars.’

8th July 1709.—‘ I do not believe the King of England has any intention of visiting the King of Sweden (Charles XII.) These Princes are too pious in their respective religions to agree well together.’

16th October 1709.—‘ The King of England fought gallantly at Malplaquet. The English were charmed with his bravery, and Marlborough drank his health in the evening,’ (an anecdote which may be doubted.)

21st April 1710.—‘ The King of England sets out literally incognito, with only two or three attendants.’

13th September 1709.—‘ The King of England has not a day of health. The Queen suffers from our present pecuniary distress.’

24th April 1712.—‘ The poor Princess Louisa \* (Stuart) is dead. She had every good and amiable quality.’

6th December 1712.—‘ The King of England edifies us all by his devout attention at mass. He has excellent qualities—religion, probity, good sense, honour. His character is prudent. He has no vivacity. His accent and manner are more English than those of many who have never been out of London.’

23d October 1713.—‘ The health of our pious Queen of England is in a bad state. She and her son want the necessaries of life. Out of mere good nature she returns from the convent at Châillot, to her little court at St Germain, where she will meet sufferers whom she cannot relieve.’

15th January 1714.—‘ The Queen of England is very languishing. She has no fear of her son’s changing his religion. He has written to her, “ I will sooner die than be wanting to God and religion.”’

---

\* The hand of this unfortunate Princess was proposed by Dr Pitcairn to Charles XII. as a reward for that Prince’s interposition for the Jacobites.

‘ Sis felix, *saveasque bonis* Succissime Cæsar  
Sic faveat Lodoix Gallo-Britanna Tibi.’

It must be owned, that the two words which close the first line savour strongly of nonsense.

The Regent, Duke of Orleans, has so much of that striking singularity which arises from the mixture of brilliant and even amiable qualities with monstrous vices, that almost all decent particulars of him are acceptable.

26th September 1706.—‘The heroes of romance are not more brave than the Duke of Orleans. He concealed his first wound, and was compelled to show the second, because his arm fell down on his side.’

In the year 1709, he obtained, through the instances of the Court of Madrid, a *terre titrée* (or a manor with a title of honour annexed to it) for his mistress, Mad. de Sercy, after a long contest with Mad. de Maintenon’s morality, which fills a considerable space in this correspondence.

29th April 1709.—‘*The Dutchess of Orleans is pregnant, at which Mad. de Sercy is said to be much offended.*’ This lady seems to have been one of the boldest of her profession. ‘She lodged in the Palais Royal, exactly opposite to the Dutchess, and took furniture out of St Cloud for her own use.’

In the year 1707, she tells her correspondent the circumstances of the death of Mad. de Montespan, and the sorrow of her children, as if she had never seen her, and with all the coldness and minuteness of a mere collector of news. In March 1711, the death of the most celebrated poet in France is thus drily, and almost contemptuously, notified. ‘The satirist Des Preaux is dead a few days ago.’ The extraordinary mortality of the Royal Family, in the year 1712, is announced with little appearance of feeling, certainly with no affectation of it, and without any allusion to the horrible rumours of poison which prevailed at the time. The only anecdote which can be called literary is, that the second representation of *Athalie* (which had been first represented under the auspices of Mad. de Maintenon at St Cyr, more than twenty years before) took place at the Dutchess de Maine’s private theatre, on the 3d of December 1714. So slow was the progress to fame of a tragedy, which is since become the boast of the drama, and perhaps of the literature, of France.

There was not in Spain, in 1707, a surgeon or a midwife to whom the Queen could be trusted. Even a nurse was sent from France. ‘The nurse whom we send to the Queen is the reverse of most of her trade—modest, polite and respectful.’ A great body of candidates, for the honour of being wet nurse to the Prince of Asturias, were collected and received at Madrid, in a manner so singular, that we shall leave Mad. des Ursins to describe it.

30th May 1707.—‘Nurses for the Prince of Asturias were collected from the farthest parts of Spain. Twelve candidates have been procured, seven whose children are born, and five pregnant. I thought that

creatures who were to suckle the first blood of the world ought to be the objects of general respect. I sent three of the Queen's carriages to meet them, and twelve gentlemen of the household to compliment them in form. They made their entry into Madrid amidst the acclamations and blessings of the people, and they came into the palace by a garden through which their Majesties only pass. I went to receive them into the Queen's gallery, and embraced them with all my heart. I then conducted them to her Majesty, who did not disdain to advance to receive them. The children made a great noise, and showed the goodness of their mother's milk, by the strength of their voices in crying. They knelt to thank her Majesty. Some of them wept for joy, others showed their gratitude by a thousand flattering, but natural speeches, which would have affected you. They then sat down to a great collation, of which they had much need. They were afterwards shown into their rooms, which were hung with the handsomest tapestries, and had every accommodation. The King came to visit them. At their supper I sat at the head of the table, and tasted every thing myself, to see that nothing was too fat or high seasoned. Some of them had not disagreeable countenances; none of them had spoiled teeth, and all were in good health.'

Among other needs which could not be supplied in Spain, the Queen earnestly begged Mad. de Maintenon to send her a cook, her chief cook being dead, and the second being spoiled by his long residence at Madrid, since his arrival in the train of Queen Louisa of Orleans. 'The Queen makes a great figure at the Cabinet Council, where she regularly takes her seat.'—Madame des Ursins seems to countenance the rumours of the horrible treatment experienced by the Princess of Orleans, the first Queen of Charles II.—'When at the Escorial,' says she, 'I had not the courage to look at the place where Queen Louisa was buried. If this Princess consecrated her misfortunes, as I believe she did, she must be a saint, for she had terrible sufferings, and I do not believe there ever was a life more miserable than that which she led.'—'I wonder how the Kings of Spain could leave Valladolid, an agreeable town, with a cheerful palace, and a beautiful neighbourhood, for Madrid, which is certainly the ugliest town in the Spain.'

But to return to Versailles. The following observation of Mad. de Maintenon is, both for severity and sense, worthy of La Rochefoucault; and it has the merit (which he has not) of being free from the affectation of epigrammatic poignancy. 'We must submit to live with deceitful, ungrateful, and wicked men; for the world is full of them. They abound most in Courts, where passions are kept up by interests.'—The letters of both ladies allude to the excessive eating and irre-

gular hours of the young Dutchess of Burgundy, of whose gluttony so much is said, that we might be almost tempted to ascribe her premature death to that disgusting species of intemperance. It is from other authorities that we know the coarseness of her manners, and the nauseous grossness of her exhibitions.

Though Louis XIV. was the veriest tool in all public measures, he was to the last degree *self-willed* in the personal management of the Court. The affairs of France were ruled by Mad. de Maintenon; But in the arrangements of a journey to Fontainebleau, she was in her turn a slave. Her complaints are bitter, and show a very hardy-worked slave. ‘My infirmities might be borne, if I could pass a life more suitable to my age. But Versailles, Marly, Meudon, Trianon, and Fontainebleau, oblige me to live as if I were only twenty. I am often obliged to get out of bed at Versailles, in order to seek rest on my bed at St Cyr, and go, for form’s sake, afterwards to sleep at Marly.’

In August 1713, as she grew older and more infirm, she feels and speaks still more sharply.

‘Nothing but the extraordinary health and strength of the King could be a consolation for the manner in which he treats those he best loves. If he made me eat half so much as he eats himself, I should not long be alive. We must not speak of inconvenience. He thinks of nothing but show and symmetry, grandeur and magnificence. He would rather have all the winds blow through his doors, than that they should not be exactly opposite to each other. I have seen him in a room with four doors and four windows, very large, and of equal size, all open. We are going to Fontainebleau, which will be still worse. As there is no preparation for the winter, I expect to suffer much.’

At Rambouillet, in August 1714, she says,

‘The King is, without exaggeration, better than he was twenty years ago. He eats as much as ever, especially at night, which makes one tremble. We are engaged in sports from morning to night. Every day the deer is cut up under my windows. Our Princesses are more robust than our soldiers, and add the freedom of a country life to the dissipation of the town.’

We are tempted to extract the following anecdote, by the whimsical resemblance of some of its circumstances to a recent abduction in our own country.

8th June 1708.—‘The Prince de Leon, eldest son of the Duc de Rohan, wished to marry Mad. de Roquelaure. The parents could not agree on the fortune; but the parties exchanged promises of marriage. The young lady was placed in a convent in the Fauxbourg St Antoine, with orders that she was not to go abroad without her governess any where but to the house of Mad. de Vieuville. The



Prince de Leon dressed his servants in that lady's livery, and putting her arms on his carriage, sent it to fetch Mad. de Roquelaure to her mother, who was said by the servants to be waiting for her at Mad. de Vieuville's. She went with her governess, who, seeing that the carriage took the wrong road, attempted to stop it, and, not succeeding, cried out for help. She was gagged; and the Prince de Leon came up to the carriage and took the young lady to a country house, where they were married. The Roquelaure family threaten a prosecution. The Dutchess of Burgundy was transported with the story, and said she liked such adventures. When the noise has subsided, the best measure will be to submit to a regular marriage.'

The last sentence in these volumes written by Mad. de Maintenon, is the following,—

11th September 1715.—'I have seen the King die like a saint and a hero. I have quitted the world which I disliked. I am in the most agreeable retirement that I can desire. As to society, I can have none. The inmates of this house (St Cyr) know nothing of what I have seen, and are acquainted with nothing but the rules of their own community.'

She survived her Royal husband more than four years. The only celebrated visitor who disturbed her retirement was the Czar Peter. That illustrious barbarian, who could not perhaps have performed the grand part allotted to him in history without an apparently monstrous union of brutal grossness and savage ferocity, with the genius of a reformer and the magnanimous ambition of a lawgiver, was probably as much unfitted by his high as by his low qualities, to appreciate her character, or to comprehend the nature of her ascendant over a feeble though more civilized monarch.

The Memoirs of the Prince de Montbarey contain the life of a silly and worthless man, written of necessity without talent, and never of the slightest value, except where it produces an effect the very reverse of that intended by the writer. He is an unwilling, and indeed unconscious witness against himself and his fellows. Perhaps the ideal ugliness of the character of a thorough-paced courtier was never more nearly embodied than in the person of M. de Montbarey. He wanted indeed the refinement, the delicacy, and the occasional vivacity or dignity which belong to the better specimens of the race. But no life could be divided between frivolity, profligacy, and servile ambition, with a more exact conformity to the most approved models. The instinct of the animal taught him to be content with the little, the vain, and the mean; never to venture on deeds of energy or violence, and not to aspire so high as the perpetration of crimes.

He was descended from a country gentleman's family in Franche Comte, of which he favours us with a genealogical tree. Some of them had, in a course of generations, risen to distinction in the army, and one had, on an extraordinary occasion, rendered a signal service to the house of Austria, the former sovereigns of the province. Some promise was then hastily made that he should be raised to the dignity of a prince of the empire, or at least the tradition of such a promise subsisted among his own descendants. If it ever existed, it seems to have been unknown beyond the country house of the family, while they continued to be nothing more than provincial gentry. Like many other tales of the same nature, it served to amuse the insipid and insignificant lives of those who, though not within sight of objects of ambition, were yet too noble for any liberal pursuit or useful occupation. A genealogy through females has always a much better chance of really finding some distinguished person in one of its many lines; so that M. de Montbarey may be believed when he tells us, that the Baron de Montclar, a French adventurer, who became a grandee of Spain in the war of the Succession, was his maternal ancestor. Both these pretensions seem to have been watchfully preserved by the Montbareys, in the hope that one of them might at last be successfully used. A series of favourable circumstances at length enabled the author of these Memoirs to urge them both with effect.

In the year 1755, he married Mademoiselle de Mailley, a young beauty of the Court, of one of the families who subsisted on the King's bounties. She was immediately appointed to the household of Madame Adelaide, a daughter of Louis XV. Her younger sister was married to the Marquis, afterwards Duc d'Avarey, the favourite, or rather the friend of Louis XVIII., a Prince who was very early distinguished by a certain show of literary talent, on which he always valued himself. Montbarey tells us an anecdote on this subject, which is curious. The deputies of some province, who came to Versailles to present an address of congratulation to the King, in making the rounds of the Court, made their compliment to the three young Princes, then almost in a state of childhood, the sons of the Dauphin. In bestowing on all these children, as a matter of course, every talent and every virtue, they praised the Duc de Berry, afterwards Louis XVI., for his abilities. The child, with a modesty and fairness which gave promise of his subsequent character, interrupted the addresser, saying—'I am much obliged to you, Sir. I am not the clever boy; but my brother Provence.' (*Ce n'est pas moi qui ai de l'esprit;*

' *c'est mon frere de Provence.* ') By the help of his Court connexions, but chiefly by means of assiduous subserviency, and without any merit, but ordinary courage and common capacity for business, in which he was probably surpassed by hundreds of corporals and clerks in France, Montbarey at length came within sight of high office. His pretensions to German and Spanish dignities then rose into view. In 1774, he became a Prince of the empire; and, in 1779, when Secretary of State for the War Department, he found no longer any difficulty at Madrid in being recognised as a Grandee of Castile—a dignity which descends by females. His daughter married a Prince of Nassau, and might consequently be the mother of a Queen of England; though his own real station in the community was not higher than that of a very moderate country gentleman; and though a law was passed, and still exists in this country, which supposes it to be a degradation for a Prince of the blood to marry into the noblest of our own families;—for example, into the House of Howard, which has possessed, for near four centuries, the unmatched distinction of being the first private citizens of the greatest of free States.

One of the most curious parts of the book is, the careful and very minute narrative of the writer's amours, from his youth upwards, to a mature or rather advanced age, which, in his own opinion, (delivered with due caution and gravity,) 'were perhaps necessary to his health;' and, if we may judge from his practice, continued to be an indispensable part of his medicinal regimen, till he had reached the age of threescore. His extreme anxiety to conceal these arrangements from Madame de Montbarey, (a lady of whom he appears always to have stood in due awe), however commendable in itself, is somewhat ludicrous in grave description. He bestows a warm panegyric on Mademoiselle Renaud, who was long his favourite. It was not one of her smallest merits, that, by her quiet and discreet behaviour, she helped him in his anxious exertions to keep peace at home. At length, however, this convenient connexion was disturbed. M. Casenove, a painter of Paris, became enamoured of Mademoiselle Renaud, and made proposals of marriage to her. Notwithstanding her gratitude to the Prince, she very naturally preferred a creditable and secure establishment with a man of her own age and station. By this desertion, which occurred when he was fifty-seven years of age, the Prince de Montbarey very seriously assures us, that he was reduced to a situation of much perplexity. He deliberated for a long time on the best means of replacing Mademoiselle Renaud. If he chose a lady of the Court, her triumph would be

an insult to Mad. de Montbarey, which she was not of a temper to brook. On the other hand, a mistress of an inferior class, and more easily reconciled to obscurity, exposed him to equal, though very unlike inconveniences. He had lately been appointed Secretary of State for the War Department. Many military appointments depended on him; and a lady whose favours were to be purchased, might very naturally traffic in preferment, or (what was just as bad) would certainly be thought to carry on that trade.

‘These considerations,’ he tells us, with historical gravity, ‘determined me on adopting a measure, by which I could pursue my own gratification, without either disturbing my domestic peace, or endangering my official character, or wasting, in the pursuit of my pleasures, any part of that time which was due to the State. As M. Lenoir, Lieutenant-General of Police, came to do business with me once a week, I explained to him my situation and my wishes! I told him frankly what I wanted, which I was willing to purchase by money. I begged him to employ all the means which his situation, at the head of the Police of the kingdom, afforded, to procure for me a person, who might, in her character, conduct, and connexions, be free from the inconveniences which I dreaded. He had the means of making a proper choice, and of watching her conduct. The person chosen would be aware that he would be informed of every step she took, and could severely punish her indiscretions. His authority over the whole class was unbounded. After this conversation, I took occasion to speak of it to *M. Maurepas*, the Prime Minister, who approved my plan! I had the address to mention it to the King himself, who, without expressly approving the plan, agreed with me that it was the least inconvenient which could be adopted. Eight days after these preliminaries, about seven o'clock in the evening, a young person, of agreeable appearance, with a letter from the Lieutenant-General of Police, was introduced into my apartment, &c. &c. &c.

No remarks can enhance the ridicule of this story, as it is told by the hero himself. It would be impossible to imagine or devise a fiction better adapted to exhibit the manners of Versailles, than this evidently true narrative. It may help an English reader to form a livelier notion of it, to be told or reminded, that the Lieutenant-General of Police in the old government of France had a large part of the province which with us is now allotted to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Sartine was about that time promoted from the Police to be Minister of Marine. We have now no Secretary of State for the War Department. During the twenty years' existence of that office, however, it has been filled by several respectable, and some distinguished men. Among the Secretaries for the

Home Department in the same period, the names of some persons of the highest character in the kingdom will occur to most readers. The most exclusively English reader may bring the negociations of M. Montbarey home to his feelings, by trying to imagine the scene which would have occurred if such propositions had passed between persons occupying these situations in this country. It is needless to mention the additional ridicule or indignation which would be excited by them, if we were to suppose our English Secretary to have consulted a Prime Minister of seventy-eight, and to have sounded his late Majesty on the occasion. Louis XVI. was indeed young; but he had more of the bashfulness and shyness, than of the passions of youth; and there were some peculiar circumstances in his personal history, which would have disposed him to listen to the communication with more than common wonder.

Accustomed as the world is to the most moral language in the mouth of those whose life is a continued defiance of every moral rule, it could hardly be supposed that any man, in the very book in which he displays his own vices, should inveigh with the utmost violence against the depravity of his age and nation. But M. de Montbarey is loud in his condemnation of the Revolution, for its hostility to religion and morality; and it may be doubted, whether his declamations arise chiefly from shamelessness, or from the want of the understanding necessary to discover his own inconsistency. A single specimen of this tone is sufficient. M. Neckar was in private life a man of virtue, and he was a minister of unsuspected integrity. But he was desirous that the power of the Kings of France should be legally limited. His desire of so destructive an innovation appears to our author so plain a proof of consummate depravity, that it could only be accounted for, by his having had the misfortune to be born at Geneva, which, in the decent language of this courtier, is called, ‘A receptacle of the dregs of all nations, where all the vices are naturalized!’

Such a picture of the low vices of frivolous men ought not to be exhibited to the public, without an endeavour to convert it to every useful purpose to which it can be reasonably applied. One reflection which may at first seem too grave to suit the description of scenes, which, considered apart from their consequences, are only contemptible, will, on more mature examination, appear to have a close and serious relation to them. In all former times, the teachers of severe morality, whether philosophical or religious, have observed the natural connection of despotic government with dissolute manners. This observation has produced a remarkable

effect on theological moralists, who have been charged (hastily and superficially) with placing pure manners too high in their ethical scale. Hence in part arose the alliance between religious zeal and the spirit of liberty, which once produced such mighty effects in Europe, and to which the free constitution of this country owes its preservation and improvement. The moralists who most condemned the vicious indulgences of the senses, were the natural enemies of that degrading rule which disqualified its subjects for every higher enjoyment. They do not often avow, and perhaps did not always distinctly perceive, this ground of the hatred of tyranny, which was one of their noblest distinctions. But it must have been evident to men of such sagacity as the first reformers, and our ancient Puritans, that the manners of the rich are most pure where the opinion of the middle and industrious classes is most valued; where objects of ambition are bestowed by their suffrages; where the most eminent of their fellow-citizens stand in need of their esteem. In a popular government, where the road to power is open to all, there are checks on the licentiousness of the affluent, and institutions which allure them to higher pursuits. The chase of popularity or power lifts them at least above the senses; they may be touched by a passion for glory; the desire of permanent praise necessarily leads to the desire of acquiring praiseworthiness; and under this discipline, a few purer spirits may at length rise to the love of virtue.

On what principles would a potent and crafty enemy of mankind construct an effective school of profligacy? He would collect together, from every quarter of a great country, all who had the most extensive means of gratification, and were least restrained by regard to the opinion of the sober and considerate classes, of whom they had nothing to hope or to fear,—of whom the men treated females of inferior rank, in all respects but one, as animals of a lower species;\* and the women considered themselves as born only to feel and inspire a passion, in which it was esteemed an honour to every new lover to teach them inconstancy; where the avowed object of the life of both sexes was pleasure,—where the only business of the more serious was to supplant each other in the favour of a single master, the distributor of every desirable object; and where agreeable vices were as effectual instruments of advancement

---

\* The influence of the profligacy of the Knights of Malta on the manners of the Maltese, as it is described by Mr Coleridge, in his beautiful account of Sir Alexander Ball, in the third volume of '*The Friend*,' strikingly exemplifies this part of the above description.

as the more obviously prevalent means of flattery, calumny, and treachery. If to these circumstances we add, that the master himself is exposed, but in a tenfold degree, to the same causes of corruption with his slaves; that each of them, in his turn, is surrounded by a circle of subaltern sycophants; that those who represent the Government in every province carry with them these manners; and that the society thus constituted becomes a model of imitation to a whole people; we may ask, whether it be possible to imagine a more irreconcilable enemy of public morals than the Court of an absolute Prince?

Many limitations and temperaments, indeed, arise in all civilized countries, which hinder such courts from being in general quite so bad as they might be expected to be, and as they sometimes are. The necessity of labour to the subsistence of the majority, the almost equal necessity of character, domestic quiet, and frugality, to the middle ranks, protect them in some degree from the contagion. But to this bad eminence Courts uniformly tend: and they approach it most nearly where Government is least subject to controul. They recede from it in proportion to the degree in which liberty is mingled with authority. Every measure of Government, every act of legislation, every vote of an individual which, upon the whole, and in the end, tends to lessen the influence of the opinion of those classes who must be orderly and provident, over the conduct of the rich and great, is an aggression against public morals which, as far as its power reaches, impairs their best human security.

The neutrality of the zealously religious party among us, in all late contests between authority and liberty, and the partiality shown by a large body of them to the side of power, seem to indicate, that they no longer perceive that important relation of civil institutions to domestic morality, which contributed to make the ancient Calvinists the most zealous friends of human freedom. From whatever causes this remarkable deviation from the example of their predecessors may have arisen, it will be strange if they should persevere in supporting principles favourable to a state of society the most fruitful in vice, and the most incompatible with every disposition towards religion. Other considerations, perhaps, of a still higher order, present themselves, which, from their importance and their peculiar nature, would require (if presented at all) to be more fully unfolded than they can be at this time and in this place. It will be sufficient, for those who have much considered such matters, to observe, that all ardent and elevated feelings have a strong, though frequently a secret connexion. They often combine for a time with other principles. They are disturbed by acci-

dental circumstances. They may be made to counteract each other. But their natural affinity is always discoverable, and most generally in the end prevails. They prepare for each other. They succeed each other. They combine together. There are no principles which have so often and so clearly exemplified these observations, as the zeal for Religion and the love of Liberty. But if the friends of religion should be blind to this affinity, they may be well assured that it never escapes the watchful jealousy of the possessors of power; who, however they may be pleased with an obedient clergy and a religion which teaches quiet, yet, as politicians, (whatever may be the exceptions of individual character) regard zeal as an ungovernable quality, tremble at the approach of every species of enthusiasm, and have a natural dread of whatever breaks upon them from that higher region of human feeling where Piety and Patriotism are kindled.

ART. VII. *A Letter to the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Surrey, on the Misconduct of Licensing Magistrates, and the consequent Degradation of the Magistracy.* By THOMAS EDWARDS, LL. D. London, Butterworth. 1825.

WE beg to be acquitted of all intention of affronting, or attacking the *Great Unpaid*. Upon the whole, though with many exceptions, and wishing for many alterations, we are favourable to the institution of an unpaid Magistracy, and are convinced that they are the instruments of much public good. What in truth could we substitute for this unpaid Magistracy? Where is the machinery for which they could be exchanged? We have no doubt but that a set of rural judges, *in the pory of Government*, would very soon become corrupt jobbers, and odious tyrants, as they often are on the Continent. But the Magistrates, as they now exist, really constitute a bulwark of some value against the supreme power of the State. They would not submit to be employed for base and criminal purposes. They are tools perhaps in some cases—but still tools that must be respected. The power trusted to so many men of fortune, communicates vigour and spirit to that body of men, and inspires them with just notions of their own importance. If any serious business arises in a county, the Magistrates assemble to discuss, advise and direct. They are properly listened to by the Government—properly listened to by the people. They are, in almost all cases, the very description of persons whom



the one ought to trust, and the other to follow. We make these observations, to show that we have no desire to depreciate so valuable a body of men; at the same time that we reserve to ourselves the fullest right of discussing, in what particular points we consider them to be intrusted with a power, which there is no occasion to confide to them—nor to any body else.

What the poor shall drink—how they shall drink it—in pint cups or quart mugs—hot or cold—in the morning or the evening—whether the Three Pigeons shall be shut up, and the Shoulder of Mutton be opened—whether the Black Horse shall continue to swing in the air—or the White Horse, with animated crest and tail, no longer portend spirits within:—all these great questions depend upon little clumps of squires and parsons gathered together in alehouses in the month of September—so portentous to publicans and partridges, to sots and sportsmen, to guzzling and game.

“I am by no means a friend to the multiplication of public-houses,” says a plump perdricide gentleman in loose mud-coloured gaiters, bottle-green jacket and brass buttons. Perhaps not; but you are a friend to the multiplication of Inns. You are well aware, that in your journeys to Buxton, Harrowgate and Bath, the competition of inns keeps down the price of your four post-horses, and secures for you and yours the most reverential awe,—from boots upwards, to the crafty proprietor himself of the house of entertainment. From what other cause the sudden and overwhelming tumult at the Dragon?—Why the agonizing cry of *first inn*? Why is cake and jelly pushed in at the window? Why are four eyeless, footless, legless horses, rapidly circumscribed by breeching and bearing reins? Why are you whisked off, amid the smiles of sallow waiters, before the landlord has had time to communicate to you the sad state of turnips in the neighbourhood? Look now a little to the right, as you proceed down the main street, and you will behold the sign of the *Star and Garter*. Make your bow to the landlord, for to him you are indebted for the gratification of your wishes, and the activity of your movements. His waiters are as sallow, his vertebræ are as flexible—his first turns as prompt and decisive. Wo to the Dragon if he slumbers and sleeps! Wo to the Star if it does not glitter! Each publican keeps the other in a state of vigilant civility; and the traveller rolls along to his journey’s end, lolling on the cushion of competition! Why not therefore extend the benefit of this principle to the poor villager or the needy traveller—which produces so many comforts to the landed and substantial Justice?

There are two alehouses in the village, the Red Horse and the Dun Cow. Is it common sense to suppose, that these two publicans are not desirous of gaining customers from each other?—and that the means they take are not precisely the same as those of important inns,—by procuring good articles, and retailing them with civility and attention? We really do not mean to accuse English Magistrates of ill nature, for in general there is a good deal of kindness and consideration among them; but they do not drink ale, and are apt to forget the importance of ale to the common people. When wine-drinkers regulate the liquor and comfort of ale-drinkers, it is much as if carnivorous animals should regulate the food of graminivorous animals—as if a lion should cater for an ox, or a coach-horse order dinner for a leopard. There is no natural capacity or incitement to do the thing well—no power in the lion to distinguish between clover and cow-thistles—no disposition in the coach-horse to discriminate between the succulence of a young kid, and the distressing dryness of a superannuated cow. The want of sympathy is a source of inattention, and a cause of evil.

The immense importance of a pint of ale to a common person should never be overlooked; nor should a good natured Justice forget that he is acting for Liliputians, whose pains and pleasures lie in a very narrow compass, and are but too apt to be treated with neglect and contempt by their superiors. About ten or eleven o'clock in the morning, perhaps, the first faint, shadowy vision of a future pint of beer dawns on the fancy of the ploughman. Far, very far is it from being fully developed. Sometimes the idea is rejected, sometimes it is fostered. At one time he is almost fixed on the Red Horse; but the blazing fire and sedulous kindness of the landlady of the Dun Cow shake him, and his soul labours! Heavy is the ploughed land—dark, dreary, and wet the day. His purpose is at last fixed for beer! Threepence is put down for the vigour of ale, one penny for the stupefaction of tobacco!—and these are the joy and holidays of millions, the greatest pleasure and relaxation which it is in the power of fortune to bestow;—and these are the amusements and holidays which a wise and parental Legislature should not despise, or hastily extinguish, but, on the contrary, protect with every regulation which prudence and morality would in any degree permit. We must beg leave to go into the Dun Cow with the poor man; and we beg our readers to come in for a moment with us. Hodge finds a very good fire, a very good natured landlady, who has some obliging expressions for every body, a clean bench, and some very good ale—and all this produced

by the competition with the opposite alehouse; but for which, he must have put up with any treatment, and any refreshment the unopposed landlord might have chosen to place before him. Is Hodge not sensible that his landlady is obliging, and his ale good? How can it be supposed that the common people have not the same distinctions and niceties in their homely pleasures, as the upper classes have in their luxuries? Why should they not have? Why should they not be indulged in it? Why should they be debarred from all benefit of that principle of competition, which is the only method by which such advantages are secured, or can ever be secured, to any class of mankind?—the method to which the upper classes, wherever their own pleasures are concerned, always have recourse. The licensers of public houses are so sensible of this, that, where there is only one inn, nothing is more common than to substitute, and make exertions to set up another, and this by gentlemen who are by no means friendly to the multiplication of alehouses.

If it is necessary that inns should be good for travellers who are not probably forced to travel—but are mere travellers of idleness and luxury—should not all means be taken to improve public houses, open for the reception of men engaged in serious, though perhaps humble business? Of the extent of the present monopoly in public houses, let the following letter suffice for an example—

“SIR,—Having been informed by Mr Ware, that the Magistrates have been pleased to appoint another meeting for Wednesday, respecting the license for the Horse and Groom public house, I take leave most respectfully to state, that before I purchased, I made due inquiries whether there was any matter affecting the license, and invariably received the satisfactory answer, that the house was well conducted, and no complaint of any sort against it.

“Upon which I became the purchaser of the lease and good-will, stock in trade, furniture and fixtures, to the amount, in the whole, of near 3000*l*. I therefore take leave most humbly to represent, that if the license be not granted, my loss will be most serious, inasmuch as the lease will not be worth *one fourth* of the purchase money; for it and the other effects will be comparatively worth but little, independently of the injury which must follow such an event.

“Under such circumstances I rest satisfied, that, in the further deliberation on the subject, their Worships will not consign me to ruin on account of any irregularity or misconduct on the part of Mr Barton, if they in the discharge of their duty, can possibly avoid it.

“Trusting that the situation in which I am involved will be allowed as an excuse for this intusion, I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient and very humble servant.”—*Letter*, pp. 93; 94.

Here are premises raised from 750*l*. to 3000*l*. by the system

of licensing; from which must be deducted certainly the good will, which, under any system, would be a fair object of barter. But what would the good will be worth,—or how much would it be reduced in worth, if any person of unexceptionable character might be allowed to open a public house? How common is it to hear publicans stating that their premises will be reduced one half in value, if a rival public house is allowed to be opened. Who pays them for the increased value, the consequence of monopoly, but the public? All persons pay an highly increased price for refreshments, by the licensing power given to Magistrates, as they would for cakes and tarts, if confectioners were licensed,—and for carpentry, if no man could knock a nail without leave of a Justice.

Public houses are not only the inns of the travelling poor, but they are the cellars and parlours of the stationary poor. A gentleman has his own public house, locked up in square brick bins. *London Particular—Chalier 1802—Carbonell 1803—Sir John's present of Hock at my marriage: bought at the Duke's sale—East India Madeira—Lafitte—Noyau—Mareschino.* Such are the domestic resources of him who is to regulate the potations of the labourer. And away goes this subterranean bacchanalian, greedy of the grape, with his feet wrapped up in flannel, to increase, on the licensing day, the difficulties of obtaining a pot of beer to the lower orders of mankind!—and believes, as all men do when they are deciding upon other person's pleasures, that he is actuated by the highest sense of duty, and the deepest consideration for the welfare of the lower orders.

The truth is, if it is intended by the Legislature that the wants and humble luxuries of the poor should be supplied in the fairest manner, and in the requisite abundance, no principle can be trusted to but the principle of competition. Nothing else can secure fair prices or civility on the part of the dispensers of these luxuries. Every landlord is sure to gratify his insolence and ill humour, and to neglect his customers, who is protected by monopoly, and knows that he can indulge in his faults with impunity. Not only is the article bad, and badly dispensed, when Justices are allowed to decide who shall and who shall not dispense it, but the public do not obtain the article in the quantity they want. For instance, there are roads where the commerce has quadrupled within the last half century, and where the Justices refuse, we have no doubt meaning to do right, to increase the number of public houses. What an enormous and abusable power is this to confide to any body of men! Who can take upon themselves to decide when the

public are sufficiently accommodated, and when they are not, except by suffering the experiment to be tried, the houses to be opened, and the publican himself to be convinced, and, by his cessation or continuance, to convince others whether he was wanted or not? All other means of deciding, except by experiment, are perfectly ridiculous. How can any Magistrate determine how much traffic has increased—how much population has increased—how far habits have altered? Do they ever make any calculation of this kind?—ever call for any documents? Is there any disposition to do it? Does any thing pass at such licensing meetings but the eternally repeated phrase, that public houses must not be increased? If any public house remains after license, is it not a proof it was wanted? If it is not wanted, how can it remain?—how can any mistake be committed in suffering the experiment to be made? There is a great deal of nonsense in Dr Edwards' book about the supply of public houses exceeding the demand. That it should do so for any length of time, is absolutely impossible. By what means is any town supplied with the precise number it wants of men who sell brown sugar, or make leather breeches? What strange havoc their Worships would make, if they were to settle the precise number of tinkers and tailors required in particular districts. Tinkers and tailors are as free as air, though not so fragrant; and, like air, they rush in to fill up a vacuum. There *can* be no redundancy of tinkers and tailors; for no man stops holes in vessels or garments from mere benevolence, but for gain; and when he loses by his trade, he gives it up. If the trade in public houses were free, there would be precisely the number wanted; for no man would sell liquor to his ruin;—and not only that, but they would be carried on by the people best qualified for the business. The lazy and the rude man would be supplanted by the active and the civil man,—as he is in all other trades which are left to the wholesome principle of competition.

But this necessity of being civil and obliging is considered by the publicans as a diminution of their respectability. As if that which is so useful and important in the grocer and cheesemonger were to produce such opposite effects in a dispenser of beer. The publican and his wife are, in fact, very often my butler and my wife's maid—in second hand clothes and second hand behaviour—who want the corrective of competition to prevent them from treating humble and ill dressed people with the most sovereign contumely and contempt. It is by no means a mathematical certainty that all ill-dressed people walking along the turnpike road are villains. The lowest of mankind have

children and relations settled at some distance from them—prosperous, and willing to receive their parents, or sick and dying, and wearying to see them. What protection has a sick and tired peasant from the intolerable insolence of one of these goddesses of rum and water, but another alehouse a quarter of a mile farther off? Pull off your superfine, Mr Justice—put on a fustian jacket and corduroy—come in covered with mud, and ask for a night's lodging,—and then see what inconvenience you are entailing upon the lower orders, by refusing to extend the number of public houses! But, as the proverb says, one half of mankind know not how the other half lives—how it dies, or what it suffers.

Absurdities are never unprolific; one generates another; and they breed very fast. Because the Magistrates erroneously refuse to allow of competition in public houses, the monopolist publican fattens on the error, becomes consequential, talks of the rights of property, and complains of the injustice of allowing a rival to compete with him, if at any time such rivalry is attempted. Can any thing be more clear than that his advantage has all along been grounded in mistake; that he holds it only by an hair; that it must give way the moment that wiser and sounder views prevail with respect to public accommodation; and that his rent ought to be proportioned, and all his plans accommodated, to the chance of such an event? But nothing is more common than to see men claiming a fec-simile in an abuse.

The immediate consequence of this monopoly, established by the reluctance of Justices to increase the number of public houses, is, that they are bought up by the brewers, and such trash forced into the throats of the poor, as an hog of the smallest degree of refinement would revolt at—deteriorated water—just enough of malt to excite indignant recollections—detestable union of treacle and quassia—nauseous sweet and nauseous bitter—Justices juice, and the natural liquor of licenses—parent of weakness and wind, carrying wild disorder into the viscera, and breaking down human strength more than the labelled phial of the apothecary! No brewer would give any extraordinary price for a public house, if he knew that any man in the village was entitled to be his competitor; or, if he purchased the house, he would of course be aware, that, to retain the preference, he must deserve it, and please the public if he wished that their favour should be continued to him.

Come we now to the great argument used—we are very sure very conscientiously, by many most respectable Magistrates—the Morals of the poor. But why are two portions of beer, good

of its kind, *drunk at two public houses*, more productive of immorality than the same quantity, and of worse quality, consumed in *one* public house? But the competitor, it may be urged, would improve the commodity, and so increase the temptation. May be so; and particularly at first it might be so; but you have no right to treat the poor like children, and hold them in such a state of tutelage. First, you lay a tax upon public houses, to prevent their rapid increase; you prevent fiddling, chuck-farthing, and every collateral temptation; you require from the publican the strongest recommendation of character; you take away his license if tipling is encouraged; you punish every individual act of drunkenness; you commit a man to prison if he neglects to support his wife and family; and then, as if all this was not enough, you drive a man into sobriety by encouraging unrivalled landlords to sell bad beer! For if the beer were no better under a new system, there would be no increase of temptation; and if the beer would be better under a new system, then is it worse under this system; and the means taken (in addition to a thousand penalties) to make the poor sober, is by making what they drink filthy—which appears to us the consummation of cruelty and injustice.

‘The corrupt contrivance of giving the owner of the house a perpetuity in the license, has enabled the brewers of bad beer to force a trade, to enslave the publicans, and to half-poison the public, by buying up these privileged houses: while the respectable brewers, to prevent themselves from being thus thrust out of the market, are driven in their own defence to adopt the same expedient, and are consequently obliged to lock up vast sums in the purchase of public houses, to keep that footing in the trade, which, under a better system, the good quality of their beer would command, without subjecting them to such enormous and never-ending drafts on their capital.’—*Letter*, p. 16.

Nor must it be forgotten, that bad beer leads to the gin bottle, and that monopoly makes bad beer. If the people cannot procure good malt liquor, they invariably have recourse to spirituous liquors. It is of the greatest importance to the health and morals of the common people, that they should be kept from the gin bottle; and there is no other method of doing it, than a perfectly free competition in the manufacture and sale of beer. Look at the present state of the trade.

‘Is there any other public house on your land at the east end of the town, besides the one which in your former evidence was described?—Yes, there is one on my Limehouse estate. I have between forty and fifty new houses on that property. I applied in vain to get it licensed; and as the Justices licensed a house very near to it in the interest of *Mr. H.*, I gave up all expectations of seeing mine licensed, and had it let in tenements. It however happened, that the owner of the other house crept out of his agreement with *H.*, and sold the lease

of the house to another interest. Mr A., the manager of Messrs H.'s brewhouse, then wrote to me, to know on what terms I would grant them a lease of my house. I agreed to grant them a lease for sixty-one years; and the house was licensed. I beg to add, that I have never expressed a wish for the licensing any other house in the Tower Hamlet division; and that I never had any interest in any public-house, excepting the two I have stated, and one on my land at Shepherd's Bush, which is at the opposite extremity of the metropolis. I have upwards of fifty houses on my land there. On each estate, my own tenants were sufficient to maintain the public-house which I provided for them, but I could not get one licensed. A brewer taking one of those houses, succeeded differently. They cost me between five and six thousand pounds, and the greater part of that sum I have in a manner lost, in the attempt to have a respectable and free public-house on each of my estates.'—*Police Report*, p. 363.

If I want to keep an alehouse, you have a fair right to inquire into my character—a fair right to prevent me turning an house of refreshment into an house of gambling and debauchery—a fair right to prevent me selling at all, if I abuse my privilege. Again, if I am a guest at an alehouse, and expose myself by drunkenness, put me in the stocks. If my wife and children are neglected, put me upon your mill. But if all is quiet, if there is no complaint against me, it is no concern of yours how I dispose of the money earned by my labour. You have no right to make laws which subject me, before I have committed any crime, to all the vexations of an odious monopoly. This is not parental care, but meddling impertinence, and tyrannical interference with freedom of action. These observations are not meant to impeach the conduct of the Justices, but the state of the laws. The laws have given this power of licensing to the Magistrates; and it cannot be expected, however it may be wished, that they should of their own accord surrender the power. The thing required is a complete alteration of the law.

All these remarks have been made, upon the supposition that the licensing system is carried on with the utmost purity, by a set of gentlemen who have nothing but the good of the public at heart, and who, if they err, err from the best intentions. The pamphlet of Dr Edwards is offered as a perfect cure to these Arcadian delusions. If he is to be credited, (and we have no means of impugning his authority), the whole of the licensing system is a scene of the most corrupt and iniquitous jobbing, not only disgraceful to Magistrates, but which would be disgraceful in the lowest criminals they commit. How will the licensing of this house affect my own public house which I have lately built? How will it affect my brother's public house? Have the brewers sent us a turtle for our licensing dinner, &c.?



If one hundredth part of the profligacy alluded to by Dr Edwards be true, the Government are most imperiously called upon to put an end to the licensing system. With the best possible intentions on the part of the Magistrates, the system would, and must be bad. What must it be if they are as corrupt and profligate as the Doctor has represented them to be? But the author shall speak for himself. 'We leave it to our readers to believe or disbelieve as they shall think good.' Certainly no such circumstances ever happened to fall under our own observation.

'In the Divisions adjoining the metropolis, the owners of public houses are men of powerful influence; persons immediately dependant on them in trade thrust themselves in as licensing magistrates, and the temptations of the patronage are enormous: the number of public houses, for instance, in this Division alone, being upwards of 830, while the number in all the other Divisions of the country taken together, amounts only to 503.'—*Letter*, pp. 10, 11,

'The next day the majority who had gone home, and some of them into the country, in the full belief that the licensing session was at an end, were surprised by a notice from the clerk, informing them that their decision had been rescinded, and that Barton's case was to be reconsidered on the 29th of September. It was afterwards ascertained, that this extraordinary measure had been adopted up stairs in the dining-room, at a dinner to which brewers and other visitors come to celebrate the termination of the licensing session; and that there was actually in the room at the time, persons who ought never to be even heard of when licensing business is under discussion. A brewer, who had sent a turtle to the licensing dinner, and the high sheriff who was a brewer's back-maker, and whose son was, till very lately, in partnership with the same brewer, being understood to be present. These gentlemen must, no doubt, have been somewhat surprised to find themselves present at an adjourned licensing meeting.'—*Letter*, p. 93.

Brewers, we believe, cannot act in the Commission; but brewers' druggists, makers of copper and iron boilers, and a thousand tradesmen connected with brewers, are not so disqualified; and of the effect of admitting them into the Commission, Dr Edwards thus speaks: \*—

'It must be admitted, that magistrates whose trades place them in immediate connexion with the owners of old, and the applicants for new public houses, by continually presenting themselves at licensing sessions, evince but little sense of what they owe to their brother magistrates, who, as a body of public men, ought not to be subjected to the possibi-

---

\* An eminent brewer, in his evidence before the Police Committee, frankly states, that his house has deemed it expedient to retain one of the clerks to the Licensing Justices, as agent, for the purpose of protecting their views with regard to licenses.

lity of censorious remark. The Legislature, it is true, has been silent with respect to the attendance of magistrates who are thus connected with brewers and builders; but their presence on such occasions tends to lower the magistracy in the estimation of the people; and that feeling of delicacy, which every one is bound to cherish who is called to rank with gentlemen, ought to have rendered unnecessary those hints on the subject, which are evidently implied in the examinations of the Police Committee. Magistrates so connected, may no doubt discharge this very important and frequently very unpleasant duty with fidelity; but they must, in so doing, incur the hazard of disobliging their best customers, and the public will scarcely give them credit for such superfluous martyrdom, when it is evident that others are ready to execute that duty without their interference. It is no secret, that a very active private canvass sometimes takes place in the metropolitan Divisions to obtain licenses for new houses; and the public, reasoning on general principles, and knowing nothing of the peculiar uprightness of individuals, will infer that a brewer's back-maker or a timber merchant may increase his business, by making himself conspicuous as a licensing magistrate in a division like this, in which it appears that no less than twenty-five new houses have been licensed in the short period of the last three years, while the speculating builders of a much larger number are looking forward in trembling hope. It is not enough that such magistrates, wrapping themselves up in their own conscious integrity, disregard the sneers of a jealous public; it should never be forgotten, that much of the usefulness of the magistracy depends on the public respect, and that it is, or at least ought to be, our only recompense, for services which occasion to ourselves infinite trouble and anxiety. On these observations, which I think it expedient to make, it is not my wish to dwell unnecessarily; but I am anxious, according to the mediocrity of my ability, to uphold the dignity of the commission in which I have the honour to be enrolled, and I regret that any thing should take place which may cause it to fall into disesteem. Where such instances occur, the common interest of the magistracy requires that they should be taken notice of. For this reason it was that I alluded to the turtle sent by a brewer to our licensing dinners; but in so doing, it was not my object to fix Mr Drummond's attention on the donor, with whose conduct I have nothing to do, but on the state of degradation to which the spirit and proceedings of a majority had reduced the Division. Viewed in their proper light, such presents, under such circumstances, constitute a practical sarcasm; they savour of an intimacy which has dwindled into contempt; and the circumstance was adverted to by me, for the purpose of showing the very low estimate of our delicacy and sense of propriety, which is taken by those who may be supposed to know us best. The singularity of accepting presents for our licensing dinners from precisely the persons who should have nothing to do with us on those occasions, was not wholly irrelevant as an exposition of the extent to which the dignity of the magistracy has been committed in this Division; yet it has been said, that I ought not to have mentioned to Mr Drummond so trivial a circumstance. Such an obser-

vation may pass current with gentlemen, who have not possessed many opportunities of becoming acquainted with the details of the police reports; but the public take a very different view of the subject. If *we* have forgotten, it is not forgotten elsewhere, that the donor of the turtle, and the son of another magistrate, are said by a publican, named Hayward, to have promised, after he had bound himself to take his beer of them, that "they WOULD DO ALL THEY COULD to get him a license;" and it appears that he did get a license for his house as soon as it was finished! The promise is denied by the donor of the turtle in his examination; but he adds, that "if any man had an impression that we could procure him a license, I should not take the trouble to tell him we could not."—*Letter*, pp. 17—20.

The real truth is, that the power of granting monopolies, or, in other words, of conferring wealth, is so desirable a power, that it is impossible, in populous districts, to prevent improper persons from obtruding themselves into the Magistracy, to obtain their share of bad power. There is but one cure; and that is, to throw the trade open, and to make the trade in hospitality as open as the trade in sugar, requiring certificates of character, and visiting abuse with penalty and disqualification. Till this is done, the scandalous abuses pointed out by Dr Edwards can never be cured.

'Opinions may be divided as to the proper remedy, but it is evident that some change is indispensable. In the evidence of an intelligent magistrate who is examined, the system is well described, "as impotence itself for the object of keeping public houses in the metropolitan divisions in order;" while the Police Committee, in their very able Report, declare on the other hand, in reference to the patronage, that they "cannot help contrasting the facility with which some new houses have been licensed against the wishes of their respective neighbourhoods, as detailed in the evidence of the magistrates, Messrs Bowles, Gifford, and Beaumont, with the refusal of others, which were unanimously petitioned for in their vicinity; and which cases evidently prove (says the Report) that the rule of *public convenience* in these instances has *not* guided the decision of the magistrates." In this passage, and in others, the misconduct of magistrates in the Brixton East half hundred is referred to in direct terms by this high authority. There is certainly great reason to suppose, that if, by any expedient, the patronage could be destroyed, we should see both fewer and more respectable public houses in the vicinity of London. It appears from the returns to the Police Committee, that the trade of the publican, like all other trades, has a tendency to find its own level, and that wherever the public houses are too numerous, they would, if left to themselves, rapidly fall into disuse, and become extinct.'—*Letter*, pp. 75, 76.

Of this same opinion is Mr Beaumont, a Magistrate, in his evidence before the Police Committee; and let it be remembered, in quoting the opinion of Dr Edwards, that it is the opinion of a Magistrate in whose division there are 830 public-houses.

' State to the Committee '—(the question is made to a Justice)—' in how many public-houses in that quarter you are interested, either as proprietor, or as agent for other persons?—I should suppose I have ten or twelve public-houses of my own, and, I should think, much about the same number as trustee and agent for some families. I cannot speak with precision at the moment.—Can you state to the Committee the names of the different signs, beginning with those belonging to yourself, and those that belong to others for whom you act?—I cannot at present.—(The witness was directed to furnish the Committee with this information.)'—*Police Report*, p. 276.—And again, ' Is there any other public-house on your land at the east end of the town, besides the one which in your former evidence was described?—Yes, there is one on my Lime-house estate. I have between forty and fifty new houses on that property. I applied in vain to get it licensed; and as the Justices licensed a house very near to it, in the interest of Messrs H., I gave up all expectations of seeing mine licensed, and had it let in tenements. It however happened, that the owner of the other house crept out of his agreement with H., and sold the lease of the house to another interest. Mr A., the manager of Messrs H.'s brewhouse, then wrote to me, to know on what terms I would grant them a lease of my house. I agreed to grant them a lease for sixty-one years; and the house was licensed. I beg to add, that I have never expressed a wish for the licensing any other house in the Tower Hamlet division, and that I never had any interest in any public-house, excepting the two I have stated, and one on my land at Shepherd's Bush, which is at the opposite extremity of the metropolis. I have upwards of fifty houses on my land there. On each estate, my own tenants were sufficient to maintain the public-house which I provided for them, but I could not get one licensed. A brewer taking one of those houses, succeeded differently. They cost me between five and six thousand pounds, and the greater part of that sum I have in a manner lost, in the attempt to have a respectable and free public-house on each of my estates.'—*Police Report*, p. 363.

Another consequence of the present foolish policy is, not only that houses are not opened when they ought to be opened, but that they are not shut when they ought to be shut. So strongly is the notion of property annexed to the existence of a public house, that it often appears to the Magistrates too severe an exercise of their power, to deny a license to an established house, whatever be the conduct of its master; the good will of which may be worth perhaps some hundred pounds; so that the monopoly not only gives the publican a power of dispensing bad beer, but of encouraging bad morals. Nobody must rival him in the sale of liquors, whatever be the nauseous draught that trickles down the throats of the people; and he is gaining so much money by this privilege, that I cannot think of taking it away, whatever injury he may be doing to the public morals! I first encourage him to be fraudulent, and for

fear of lessening the profits of his fraud, I will not punish his vice.

'The same reasoning is more strongly applicable to the improper grant of a transfer or a renewal. I have already observed, that whenever this takes place, the pretext is an affected regard for private property, and that magistrates who put forward this doctrine are too frequently influenced by a very different motive. They must be aware, that it ought to satisfy the owner of a public house, that, like any other landlord in losing his tenant, he gets his house back again; but it is said that this is not enough, because as a public house it either yielded a larger rent, or enabled him to compel his tenant to take his beer from a particular brewer. Now, on what principle, I would ask, is the owner of a house, in which a shop is opened to sell beer, to be upheld in putting an exorbitant rent upon it, by which either his tenant or the public must be injured, because that tenant, for the convenience of the public, and not certainly for the profit of the owner, has obtained a license *personal to himself*, which costs the owner of the house nothing, and with which he has nothing to do? Whenever a house is sold or let on terms above its intrinsic value, in consequence of a circumstance so perfectly adventitious, it is obvious that those who drink the beer must ultimately bear the burthen; and for the protection of that public whose interest alone it is the duty of magistrates to consult, there can be no doubt, that, in all such cases of extortion, the license ought to be, and where magistrates are honest, would be, removed to some other house in the same neighbourhood. The coarse fittings up of a public house are not more peculiar or expensive than those of butchers and bakers, who require their slaughter-houses and their bake-houses; and yet, what owner of a house so occupied ever thinks of claiming an indemnity from the public for the accident of his tenant quitting trade or removing? To put the case more strongly, I will suppose the owner to be a mealman or a grazier, who had determined that the public should only consume bread and meat of such quality, and at such a price, as it might suit his interest to furnish; it would assuredly afford no very solid title to commiseration on losing his tenant, if he were to urge, that, in the full expectation that the nefarious scheme would prove successful, he had purchased the house at a price above its real value. These, however, are instances which at the worst would be limited in their injurious effects to the public pocket, and possibly to the public health; but the substitution of private interests for the principle of "public utility," in the licensing of victualling houses, not only involves both those considerations, but goes directly to affect the public morals over which magistrates are appointed to watch. The abuse can only be accounted for by the fact, that whenever the legal principle of "public utility," is suffered to prevail, magisterial patronage is worth nothing.'—*Letter*, pp. 22-24.

We hope the last sentence of this quotation will not be lost upon our readers. In an advanced state of civilization, there

must be also an advanced state of misery. In the low public houses of great cities, very wretched and very criminal persons are huddled together in great masses. But is a man to die starved in a ditch, because he is not rich, or even because he is not innocent? A pauper or a felon is not to be driven into despair, and turned into a wild beast. Such men must be; and such men must eat and sleep; and if laws are wise, and police vigilant, we do not conceive it to be any evil that the haunts of such men are known, and in some degree subject to inspection. What is meant by respectable public houses, are houses where all the customers are rich and opulent. But who will take in the refuse of mankind, if monopoly allows him to choose better customers? There is no end to this mischievous meddling with the natural arrangements of society. It would be just as wise to set Magistrates to digest for mankind, as to fix for them in what proportion any particular class of their wants shall be supplied. But there are excellent men who would place the moon under the care of Magistrates, in order to improve travelling, and make things safe and comfortable. An enhancement of the evil is, that no reason is given for the rejection or adoption. The Magistrates have only to preserve the most impenetrable secrecy—to say only No, or Yes, and the affair is at an end. No court can interfere, no superior authority question. Hunger and thirst, or wantonness and riot, are inflicted upon a parish or a district, for a whole year, without the possibility of complaint, or the hope of redress. Their Worships were in the gout, and they refused. Their Worships were mellow, and they gave leave. God bless their Worships!—and then, what would happen if small public houses were shut? Would villany cease? Are there no other means by which the bad could congregate? Is there so foolish a person, either in or out of the Commission, as to believe that burglary and larceny would be put an end to, by the want of a place, in which the plan for such deeds could be talked over and arranged?

‘ Then there is a description of houses which have sprung up of late years, and are more mischievous than the public houses, over which the Magistrates have no summary power: they are called coffee-houses, or coffee-rooms, and open at eleven, twelve, or one at night, and remain open during the whole of the night; so that, when idle people are driven out of the public-houses, they first find an harbour in those places, and can afterwards go to the early market-houses.

‘ Are they obliged to take out a license?—No, there is no license at all. Even some eating-houses, or cook-shops, have got in the way of keeping open all night, in which hot victuals, roast pigs, and joints of meat are provided, and people (men and women of any description) are received. I have seen them open till four o'clock in the morning.

‘ Do they not there sell liquor ?—No, not spirituous liquors ; but they sell spruce-beer and ginger-beer, and those sort of things,—*Police Report*, p. 58.

Dr Edwards quotes, with great blame, the report of a Committee of Magistrates, in which we can discover nothing but humanity and good sense. It runs as follows.

“ It must be remembered of what description of persons the inhabitants of Kent Street and its neighbourhood are composed. A very considerable number of the tenants, both of the public and private houses, are, and have been, time out of mind, supported by letting them out in lodgings to persons of the lowest class of the community ; of whom, Dr Colquhoun says, above twenty thousand rise every morning without knowing how they are to be supported during the passing day, or where, in many instances, they are to lodge in the succeeding night. It is a fact easily to be proved, that no small portion of a publican's support in this neighbourhood is derived from persons of this description. An instance has been pointed out to your Committee, by an intelligent officer of the police, of a public house in Kent Street, in which not less than fifty people sleep every night, and few of them are believed to accommodate less than twenty or thirty. Many of the private houses are also occupied in a similar way. The miserable accommodations that are met with at these dreary abodes, and the deplorable shifts to which the persons who resort to them are obliged to submit, are distressing beyond the powers of imagination ; yet, however cheerless, however destitute they may be of comfort, they are nevertheless in request, they are useful ; nor under the existing state of society are they to be dispensed with. Annihilate the swarms of beggars with which the metropolis abounds, and the number of public houses in Kent Street, and in similar situations, may undoubtedly be dispensed with ; but while the one is suffered to exist, the other must be tolerated ; and cold indeed must be the heart which, after taking all due precaution for securing the peace and good order of such a neighbourhood, can cherish the most distant idea of depriving these unhappy beings of any of the scanty enjoyments which fall within the reach of their slender means to obtain.”—*Letter*, pp. 27, 28.

These then are the propositions on which we principally insist.

The benefit of that principle of competition which is so useful to the rich, ought not to be withheld from the poor. To withhold competition, is to establish monopoly ; monopoly enhances the price of refreshments to the stationary and the travelling poor ; deteriorates the quality of those refreshments ; and renders those who dispense them indifferent whether their conduct is satisfactory to their guests.

It is quite impossible for any body of men, acting under the most upright intentions, to ascertain when the public are, or are not sufficiently supplied with houses of hospitality, or with any other commodity. The only method of ascertaining what the

market wants, is by leaving the market free. Upon this principle, and upon this principle alone, there can be no more public houses than are wanted, and there will be no less. It is impossible to prevent any body of men from turning to their own advantage an absolute and uncontrollable power, given to them for the public good; and, if *Dr Edwards's testimony is true*, those public houses are only opened and only put down, whose license or demolition injuries no Justice's property, nor the property of any Justice's relation, nor the property of any brewer who has an interest over him, nor exposes any Justice's game to depredation.

To tax the publican for his license—to make rigid inquiry into his character—to deprive him of his license if he sins—to punish drunkenness—to punish the father of a family if he neglects his children—are all fair and just means of preserving decency and order; but to meddle with men's actions beyond this, to deter men who keep clear from the law, by the vexations of an odious monopoly, from spending their money as they please, is to keep them in a state of infantine tutelage, and is to rule them upon the principles of a very odious tyranny. We charge Justices with nothing; for we have little means of knowing any thing about them; but Dr Edwards brings charges against them of the most odious nature. It is the duty, as we are sure it will be the wish of Mr Peel, to give these charges his most serious consideration. We sincerely hope they may be fully and fairly answered. Whether they are or not, our objections rest upon other grounds. Let the Magistrates be as upright and pure as they can be, the power of licensing ought not to be trusted to any body of men. It is an interference with the wants and comforts of society which it is *impossible* to exercise with judgment and propriety; which entails innumerable inconveniences and privations upon the lower orders of mankind, whether travelling or stationary; and which would have been exploded years ago, if the sufferers had been any other than dumb creatures, unable to tell their own story. The Magistrates will probably be very angry to lose this branch of power. We are sorry for it; for we have no wish to offend those, whom we consider upon the whole as an useful body of men. But it is absolutely necessary to do it, or to begin to do it. When a measure is wise, there is no objection to its being popular. The gratitude of the common people would know no bounds for an emancipation from the thralldom in which they are held by the licensing power of Justices. Mr Sturgess Bourne has wisely prevented Magistrates from being generous with other's people's money—we hope Mr Peel will prevent them from being sober and moral with other people's ale.



- ART. VIII. 1. *Parliamentary History and Review; containing Reports of the Proceedings of the Two Houses of Parliament during the Session of 1825-6, Geo. IV.; with Critical Remarks on the principal measures of the Session.* 8vo. pp. 808. Longman and Co. London, 1826.
2. *Parliamentary Abstracts; containing the Substance of all important Papers laid before the Two Houses of Parliament during the Session of 1825.* 8vo. pp. 722. Longman and Co. London, 1826.

THESE two books form, properly speaking, one work; the latter being a second volume, or Appendix, to the first; and only printed separately, in order to accommodate purchasers. The publication is intended to be annual; and we look upon it as extremely important. The plan is excellent; and if the execution bears any proportion to the merits of the design, it is undoubtedly calculated to serve the very best purposes. We feel anxious, therefore, to lose no time in recommending it to the attention of our readers; and, with this view, we shall describe the nature of the work a little more fully than is done in the very meagre notice prefixed to the second volume, the first having no prefatory matter to usher it in. We shall, at the same time, offer some suggestions for the improvement of the plan, and a few hints, which we trust may not be thrown away upon its conductors, touching some faults that have crept into the execution. But, first, we wish to say a few words upon the publication of Parliamentary proceedings generally.

There is certainly no change in the administration of public affairs more striking than the complete opening of the doors of Parliament to the whole inhabitants of the country, which has been effected by the regular and, we may say to every practical purpose, authorized publication of all its debates and all its divisions. When the Annual Register was begun in 1758, and for several years after, we find no mention of what was passing in either House, except incidentally, and in a single sentence. Even in recording the changes of ministry, and describing the state of parties, without reference to the debates, the initials only of the names are given; it is Mr F— and Mr P— and the D. of N— for Mr Fox, Mr Pitt, and the Duke of Newcastle. The questions connected with Mr Wilkes, in 1764, gave rise, for the first time, to a separate chapter on the Parliamentary history; which is given for some years after, in a very general manner, and with no reference to particular speakers. The substance of the

arguments used on either side of the chief questions, is presented, with no more particularity as to the persons using them, than is to be found in the fanciful summaries given by Hume in his History. It was not till the American War that the subject was handled in any detail; And yet during all that time, even during the six years when the existence of Parliament is scarcely referred to, its deliberations were of the highest importance, and excited the most lively interest; for, beside the great questions connected with the conduct of the War, and the making of peace, there were all the personal and party matters of Admiral Byng, Mr Fox's resignation and return to office, Mr Pitt's ministry and resignation, and Lord Bute's succession to, and loss of place. Nor was there any lack of political readers; for, though a much smaller proportion of the people then took an interest in public affairs, the Press was incessantly active in providing food for those who then composed the world of politics. Indeed, there can be no doubt, we think, that the war of pamphlets and newspapers was carried on even with greater effect,—that is to say,—what was then called public opinion, the opinion of those who read on political matters, was much more under the influence of political writers, and those who hired them, than it is in the present times. Because there was nothing else read on the subject of politics; whereas now-a-days, all the other political reading of the country bears but a small proportion to the daily reports of the debates in point of bulk; and in point of effect, a still smaller proportion. We shall look in vain for any effects produced in our times, by the most powerful tracts, circulated the most widely, and recommended too by the highest names, comparable to the sensation excited, and the actual influence exercised, by Swift's pamphlet on the '*Conduct of the Allies*,' published without his name; and it may be questioned whether even Mr Burke's pieces on French affairs, addressed as they were to the passions which the prodigious events of the day were working upon, would have been practically felt in the determination of public opinion, if all that was at the same time spoken and decided in Parliament had inclined to the opposite side, instead of taking almost entirely the same course. In one sense of the word, indeed, the Press never was so powerful as at the present day;—for the readers are far more numerous than they ever were before; and the writings upon all subjects are multiplied in proportion. Indirectly and remotely, therefore, a very great effect is produced by the discussions thus carried on, in enlightening and fixing the opinion of the country upon public affairs, and the questions connected with them. In so far, the Press

may be said to influence the public opinion upon each particular occasion, and thereby to influence the debates and decisions of Parliament itself. But if we estimate the influence which the Press exerts directly, when brought to bear immediately upon any given subject, we shall find it to be by no means equal to that of the Parliamentary discussions; while there can be no doubt that these have also much more effect and authority in moulding the general opinions of the community. A great sensation may, upon any question, be excited by pamphlets and newspapers; and public meetings may increase this materially. But it is in vain to deny, that the community looks with far greater interest to the debates upon the same subject in Parliament; and we accordingly find, that the meeting of this body deprives all other disquisitions of the attention which was bestowed upon them during the recess.

We are very far from asserting that the preference thus given is merited by the intrinsic superiority of the Parliamentary debates; we are not even sure that there is any preference bestowed upon them. But they have the important advantage of tenfold publicity. While the reasonings of a pamphlet, however successful, make their way to a few hundreds, or, it may be, by dint of extraordinary merit, and by force of an author's name, a few thousand readers, chiefly in London and the great provincial towns,—while the most extensively circulated periodical works are confined each to a particular class of readers,—while the newspapers, in like manner, circulate each in one limited direction,—the arguments that are urged in Parliament reach every part of the country, and are read by all who ever read any thing. They are therefore brought to the knowledge of the whole body of readers. But this is far from being all the advantage which they enjoy. Every one of the London newspapers, and, after them, every one of the country papers, may publish a discussion, taken from some valuable work, and solicit the attention of their readers to it;—the request will, as far as the majority of them are concerned, assuredly be made in vain;—they will not read. But the discussion, if propounded to them under the head of a debate in Parliament, and as the speech delivered by Lord Such-a-one or Mr Such-a-one, in their places in either House, will be read and attended to by all who ever read upon such subjects; by many who never read any thing else respecting them; and will be talked of by many who never read at all upon those or any other subjects. Reports of proceedings at public meetings approach nearest to those of Parliamentary debates; but they are left far behind, even in the extent of their publicity—still further in the in-

terest excited by them, and, consequently, in the impression they make. Those of trials in courts of law cannot be compared with either, because the subjects are, except very rarely, not the same; and even political topics, being there handled by lawyers, who are very seldom statesmen, although the discussion may obtain nearly the same publicity, come with far less effect upon the minds of the people. But suppose even that the proceedings at any meeting, or any trial, were of a kind so interesting as to find their way to every reader, and excite the same attention with the most important Parliamentary debate—it is only once, and away. The impression is gone to-morrow; as it may be indeed with the debates in Parliament, that is, with any one debate: But the grand difference is, that the debates go on day after day—the subject is revived over and over again;—the same persons renew their appeals to the same readers for weeks and months, in every variety of discussion—in speech and in reply—in good set phrase and interlocutory remark—in grave formal debate and in passing conversation;—and the speakers at last become known to the readers almost as if they debated in their presence. Thus, whether they deserve it or not, the Parliamentary debaters, from belonging to the body which has in its hands the honour of making laws, and indeed directly or indirectly ruling the country, have by far the greatest weight in regulating the public opinion upon any given question, and the greatest influence in directing that opinion generally upon subjects connected with public affairs.

It is not easy to estimate the power which Parliament has thus acquired over the country, and the degree in which the systematic publicity of its proceedings has enabled it to tax and to rule. We may, indeed, form some judgment of the force employed, by observing the effect produced. We have seen one Parliament spend, in twelve months, a hundred and thirty-three millions, and another thank the Minister for the Walchern expedition! There is no saying to what a people may be brought by the art, so well known to cunning rulers, of making their advances slowly upon the purse and the liberties of the people; and we cannot therefore pronounce with certainty, that, under the old system of debating with closed doors, as they did in the Seven-years War, the expenditure *might* not have been increased gradually from thirteen to a hundred and thirty millions, and the debt from eighty to eight hundred. But nothing surely can be more improbable, than that such burthens should have been submitted to by a people who had become universally thinkers and talkers upon every subject of a political cast, unless they were allowed either to raise the money themselves,

by representatives whom they had actually chosen, or received something in the place of this contract—some share in the management of their own concerns, taken as an equivalent for the right of election. The ruling powers had apparently but one of these two courses open; either to let the people appoint their stewards, or to give what might be taken as a substitute for the power of appointment; and as it was by no means clear that the stewards chosen by them would concur in the expenditure required, it must have been an agreeable surprise to find the people just as well satisfied with being suffered to inspect the accounts, and see how the measures for raising the money were founded, and what were the reasons given for raising it. In a word, we have very little voice in the choice of those who are to spend our money for us; but we are allowed to hear all they have to say in their own behalf while their hands are in our pockets; and this seems to prove quite as satisfactory.

Thus it is with all the measures of Government. Suppose the people knew nothing of Parliament, except that it sat, and made itself felt through the tax-gatherer; it is easy to see how limited would be its power in any way, especially in taxing. But a different course is pursued. The Parliament meets. After due announcement that an important Session may be expected, and a general expectation, accompanied with some conjectural discussion of the measures to be propounded, some exaggerated rumours of heavy imposts are scattered doubtfully among the people; and the meeting becomes the more interesting, and the proceedings are the more anxiously watched. A gracious speech is made from the Throne. The Sovereign possibly delivers it in person, and every anecdote connected with this imposing solemnity is sedulously gathered up, and greedily received by the whole community. Solemnities yet more imposing follow. The necessities of the State are the theme of many an eloquent harangue; and of this no doubt can exist, whatever may be said of the cost, or on whomsoever the fault may rest—the money is wanted, and must be had. All these things are canvassed again and again. Various opinions are delivered, and supported by very different men; and after the debate, comes the resolution of the majority, that the money must be raised! *How* it shall be raised, is the next question. But as the necessity of raising it has been recognised, an answer is at hand to every argument that can be urged against the means proposed, be they ever so bad. Nevertheless, the new impost is, after being propounded and expounded with every variety of detail, comment, calculation and estimate, thoroughly discussed in all its bearings, so that

every thing which can be said on the subject by men of the most opposite opinions, the most conflicting interests, and the most different turns of thinking, is said, during the various stages through which the measure passes. All these discussions are anxiously followed by the people, who read, or hear read or related, almost every thing that has passed in the course of them; and thus become acquainted with the measure from its first development to the period of its becoming a law of the land. They are satisfied with this. They find, that, whatever could have occurred to themselves, has been stated by some one or other, in some stage or other of the business; they even perceive that concessions have been made, in consequence of several of the objections urged; a vent has thus been afforded for their discontent; and somewhat too has been gained, or seems to have been gained,—for the measure may have been purposely brought forward worse than it was intended to be made. All these considerations reconcile them to it. But, independent of all these, and above them all, is the mere reading of the speeches; and being thus addressed constantly by so many persons for whom, whether deservedly or not, they feel, in point of fact, more or less respect, either on account of their station, or qualifications. Nor can there be any doubt that the mere effect of the debates thus made universally public, would contribute greatly towards reconciling the country to the tax, were it carried through without any modification.

What is true of a new tax, is equally true of every other measure; and when the executive government has, by its conduct, exasperated the people, or by its imbecility cast them into despair, the aid of Parliament effectually restores tranquillity and confidence, by the same process that makes the most hateful impost bearable, if not palatable. A great agitation prevails in men's minds at some wanton act of military violence; or a gloom is spread over them by the gross mismanagement of a warlike operation, to the manifest peril of the State, as well as the grievous waste of lives and treasure. The Press teems with pamphlets, the newspapers are vehement in discussing the interesting topick of the day; meetings are holden, which increase the ferment. To a stranger, every thing seems big with peril and alarm: but the experienced tactician knows well how to meet the storm, and escape in perfect safety, possibly with an accession of strength, from the dangers into which he has plunged his country, but through which he himself can walk unhurt. He lets the tempest rage for a while, till it is partly exhausted, and then pours oil upon the troubled waves, by calling together the Great Council of the nation. The

two regular meeting-houses straightway supersede all other assemblages; the great debating shops are opened, and all other wranglings are suspended; the '*great talk*,' as some countries term it, the '*Palaver*,' as they call it elsewhere, is begun, and throws the lesser disputes into the shade; the daily volumes of disquisition are issued, and nothing else is read or talked about. Already much is done towards allaying the agitation that prevailed, or inspiring the hope that seemed dead; a breathing time is afforded, at least, while redress is expected; or desponding men are taught to look somewhere, who had felt persuaded that no quarter to which the eye might turn could afford any prospect of relief. It is true, this melancholy foreboding is most frequently confirmed by the result. It is true, an almost endless discussion ends at last in a civil, but firm refusal of any redress, and a distinct approval of all the misconduct complained of, and an expression of thankfulness for whatever was most imbecile in the management that led to boundless disaster. But all this is done with so much form and solemnity—with such delay and circumlocution—with so many able speeches from so many known individuals of high station and authority, if not of the most profound wisdom, or the most disinterested natures, that the people are gradually reconciled, perhaps even convinced. At all events, the subject has been thoroughly discussed both in Parliament and out of doors, and they have read and heard every thing that has been said or could be said upon it; and if they are still discontented, they keep their ill humour to themselves, and think little, and say less, upon a question now disposed of, and fated to be speedily forgotten!

We have entered into these particulars for the purpose of illustrating the prodigious accession of power with which the publication of the Parliamentary Debates has armed the Legislature, and, through the Legislature, the Executive Government. The common remark is, indeed, singularly ill founded which holds out this publicity as all so much gained by the people, and parades it as a sacrifice made by the Parliament. The jealousy which that body betrays of any rival dealers in debates, though perhaps groundless, shows how instinctively it feels the importance of having a monopoly. When English delegates met in 1817, to discuss from day to day the state of the representation, an Act was immediately made, declaring their meetings unlawful. When the Irish Catholics associated for obtaining a redress of grievances, they were prohibited from meeting above a few days at a time. The apprehension, that discussion, carried on regularly upon subjects highly interesting to the country by persons not Parliamentary, and in places other than the purlieus of Westminster Hall, would engage the attention of the com-

minity, and interfere with that undivided regard which is necessary for preserving its authority, was unquestionably the principal reason for adopting those very strong measures.

Considering the immense advantages derived by the Government from the power with which Parliament is thus invested—that power in the present state of the representation, and with the patronage belonging to the Crown, being entirely available to the use of the Executive,—it becomes a very doubtful matter, whether all the benefits derived to the country from the publicity of the debates, be not more than counterbalanced by the means, both of attack upon popular rights and escape from the consequences of misrule, thus placed at the disposal of the Crown's servants. But at least this is manifest, that it becomes of consummate importance to keep the attention of the people unremittingly upon the conduct of the individuals who bear a part in those Parliamentary discussions; and to canvass with the most perfect freedom every thing that is said in the course of them. This is absolutely necessary, not only to keep up some control over men who, for the most part, are appointed without the consent of those whom they assume to represent, and who are absolutely irresponsible, except to public opinion, for what they say and do in their public capacity; but it is also essentially necessary for the purpose of preventing errors from being propagated by that most powerful instrument which we have been describing, formed by the combination of the whole Press of the country, under the moving force of the Crown and the two Houses.

The double object of checking and improving the debaters, and of preventing their errors from proving injurious among the people, is evidently best attained by passing under review from time to time the most important passages of Parliamentary history. This cannot be done by the newspapers, for many reasons which are sufficiently obvious; but if it could, the advantage would be inconsiderable, because no one recurs to a discussion, how able soever, in a daily or weekly publication; and it is of the greatest moment to have the Parliamentary commentaries of which we are speaking, preserved for repeated consultation and comparison. Another advantage arises from such periodical reviews, of no little account; that whereas debates, however important the subject, or however ably they are handled, are read only at the time, and even when collected in yearly volumes, are only consulted occasionally for reference, these discussions of their merits, and of the topics connected with them, will tend to preserve the recollection of whatever is most useful in them, and to perpetuate its salutary influence. The work



before us, if well conducted, seems well calculated to secure these salutary and important ends.

The design is, in the first place, to give a correct Report of the Debates of the Session, arranged under different heads, and collecting together all the discussions of the least importance which took place upon each subject. Thus, under the head of Ireland, we have all the debates which took place in either House upon the Catholic Association, the question of Emancipation, the Two Wings, and the Irish Church Establishment. Under the head of Law, we have the debates upon the Judges' Salaries, the Court of Chancery, the Jury Bill, the Game Laws, and the bills to prevent Cruelty to Animals. Nothing is omitted but the conversations which arose upon points of order, arrangements respecting the day of debating any particular question, and other matters of the like kind, the interest of which is gone as soon as the business is disposed of. The manner in which these Reports have been prepared is not stated. The advertisement to the Second volume states, that they 'have been carefully revised and collated;' from which we conclude that they are not original reports, but compiled, by selecting the best newspaper reports of each speech, and adding any that may have been published separately. As the whole Session is compressed into less than six hundred pages, the size is considerably less than that of the Parliamentary Debates so ably edited by Mr Wright; but the type is extremely, and indeed painfully small. This part of the work appears to be faithfully performed: and it is certainly a material convenience, to find the whole that belongs to one subject brought together, without hunting over two or three volumes by help of an index—and to find it, too, without the interposition of matter wholly insignificant. A larger type alone seems wanting to render this part of the book complete; and this ought to be given, at the risk of increasing the bulk and the cost.

To the Debates in the first volume, the Abstracts of Parliamentary Papers in the second, form an Appendix, of the greatest possible utility. The papers yearly printed fill about fifty folio volumes; many of them contain information of great value; but some are wholly useless; all admit of being methodized and abridged; and hardly any can be found, from which part may not safely be cut off, except the accounts; and even these are more easily consulted in an octavo, than in a folio page. In this publication, all the most important papers are either given entire, or judiciously abridged, and all the Accounts are given at length. The convenience of having so great a mass of accounts brought together in a form which makes them accessible, can

only be understood by those who are accustomed to wade through the annual folios of the House of Commons, and to be lost in that ocean of figures. To this and the Debates, there is wanting a copious index. It will add somewhat to the bulk, indeed; unless it adds considerably, it will be of little value; but, well executed, that is, full, its utility will be great. At present, there is not even an index to the speakers' names.

The Prefatory Treatise consists of an abridgement of Mr Bentham's excellent Book of Fallacies, to which we called the attention of our readers in our 84th Number (vol. xlii. p. 367). This abridgement is very ably made; but we do not exactly agree with the author, that it furnishes an instrument which will enable the reader of the Debates at once to discover the fallacies more prevalent in legislative assemblies, as he says, than among the rest of the community. We think the Treatise is very well worth reading; and that, with the exception of some exaggeration, and a good deal of '*the fallacy of vituperative personality*,' thinly concealed, it abounds in true and useful matter. But men will not judge of the debates by means of this as a test; and we have sufficient proof of it in the work before us, which, after promising to make frequent reference to the '*Instrument*,' pronounces on almost all the matter discussed, pretty much as if it had no existence. Two or three times only is it referred to.

But although the *test* is not much used, the principles upon which it is constructed are those which pervade most of the political disquisitions. They are very plainly, not to say bluntly, stated in several parts of the Prefatory Treatise. All men it is asserted, are influenced solely by a regard to their individual interests—'in its strict meaning, self-interest is the mainspring of human action.' To lament this would show as much weakness as to deny it would show ignorance. It is the principle which at once moves and binds together all human society. But if this is the mainspring of men's conduct in general, most emphatically is it the actuating motive with men in power or authority; and for the rulers of a country to affect superior honesty, or for their political adversaries to affect purity of motives, is represented as the most shameless imposture. Whoever pretends that he acts upon public principle, or from a sense of duty, is an 'impudent pretender,' or 'quack,' who, in opposition to the unvaried experience of ages, would have us believe that he is exempt from the common incident of humanity, the disposition to prefer self to others. But if these things are predicable of men in authority more than of other men, it is in the British Parliament, it seems, that they are most strikingly exem-

plified. These causes of bad reasoning having been specified, weakness of intellect, imperfection of language, and sinister interest, the discourse thus proceeds.

Now, of the three causes of bad reasoning which we have just specified and explained, the sinister interest of the individual disputant is, to an incalculable degree, the most fertile and fatal source of error and delusion. Weakness of intellect may be aided, by instruction, by practice, or the discovery of motives for desiring the attainment of truth;—the imperfections of language may be guarded against and remedied by habits of rigid investigation;—but sinister interest opposes to the reception of truth an obstacle almost as insuperable as it is extensively prevailing. The bias which it communicates to the intellect of the individual exposed to it, leads him, often unconsciously, to embrace and receive with disproportionate regard all arguments which tend to support this interest, and to overlook or undervalue all which make against it;—to find a useful ally in every imperfection of language;—to acquiesce in established opinions as in established abuses;—to deprecate inquiry, and even to sneer at any exertion of the thinking faculty.

To what extent the Members of the British Parliament are exposed to the action of sinister interest, is fully understood by those who are aware that these Members conduct, subject to no immediate check, the expenditure of an immense fund raised by taxation:—subject to no immediate check, because they are neither elected nor removable by the people, whom they are said *virtually* to represent, but in considerable numbers avowedly purchase their seats, while a majority of them are indisputably placed in the House by about 180 powerful families, who, either in possession or expectancy, have a direct interest in a prodigal expenditure of the public money, and, as far as possible, in appropriating it to their own purposes. We say, not *elected*, even by those who vote; because, according to the ordinary experience of human nature, the candidate or his friend may be affirmed to have it in their power to *compel* a vote, so long as they have it in their power to make the voter expect evil at their hands if he votes one way, and good if he votes another; and this power they clearly have wherever the open mode of conducting suffrage enables them to ascertain with precision which way a vote has been given.' pp. 3, 4.

What then, it is demanded, has prevented the country from being ruined by the prevalence of sinister motives, in those who have engrossed all the direct power of the State? What makes England, in point of fact, more prosperous than Russia or Spain? The publicity of discussion, it is answered, and the liberty of the press, which has always existed in spite of the laws and the standing orders of the two Houses. This has established a tribunal of public opinion, to which Parliament is obliged in the long run to defer.

But it is the co-existence of this unacknowledged power with a frame of Government, the members of which are exposed to the action of a powerful sinister interest, that renders the use of fallacies more necessary to the British Parliament than to any other deliberative assembly. In countries where freedom of the press and public discussion do not exist, the interests of the many are openly and unhesitatingly sacrificed by force to the interests of the few: the people have it not in their power to require reasons, and no reason is given but the supreme will of the ruler. In England, on the contrary, these ends can only be attained by fraud. In consequence of long established habits of public discussion, the people are too mindful of their own interests, and too strong, to allow them to be openly violated: reasons must be given, and reasons sufficient to satisfy or deceive a majority of the persons to whom they are addressed. Now, as it is impossible by fair reasoning, with reference to the avowed ends of Government, to justify the sacrifice of the interest of the many to the interests of the few, and as we have shown that the Members of the British Parliament are placed in a position which must induce them more or less to attempt this sacrifice, it follows that, for effecting this purpose, they must have recourse to every kind of Fallacy, and address themselves, when occasion requires it, to the passions, the prejudices, and the ignorance of mankind.' p. 4.

There may be some exaggeration in all this; we cannot, for instance, admit that no man or bodies of men are influenced by patriotic motives. We see daily many sacrificing to their principles every consideration which ordinary minds deem the most valuable, labouring to promote the success of their own opinions, if we must not say the good of their country and of mankind, and pursuing this object to the exclusion of every enjoyment which the bulk of mankind prize the most dearly. A still smaller number we find encountering smaller losses and inconveniences, and making sacrifices of less important prospects, but still following what they deem the line of public duty against their private interest. And if we should be told, that all those men do so because they feel greater pleasure in the success of their opinions or principles and in the triumph of the cause they have espoused, and that, consequently, they act selfishly in obeying the more powerful impulse, we answer, that this is only disputing about a word; and that it is using the word selfish in a sense quite different from its acceptation in the charge made against public men. Neither can we quite admit, that if things were so very bad within the walls of Parliament, there would be any great deference very long shown towards the 'tribunal of public opinion' established without. Admitting too that there is a control exercised over its proceedings by the public, and that the Press, by influencing the popular feeling, checks the Parlia-

ment, we cannot quite allow that the publication of the debates is the main preventive to the despotism of Parliament and the check upon its misgovernment, looking back, as we must, to the times not very remote, when those debates were not published, and the influence of Parliament in the country was far less than at present. Nevertheless, it must be conceded, that the tendencies of the system are such as the principles above cited assume; and that enough of the doctrines laid down is well founded, to warrant the conclusion, that the utmost vigilance is required in marking the proceedings both of public men and bodies of men, clothed with high authority, whether in the shape of actual power, or only in that of weight and influence; and that the safe side on which to err is, that of excessive distrust, chosen by the conductors of this work, although it frequently leads to very grievous mistakes, and is the occasion of flagrant injustice, both towards individuals and towards parties.

It is not, of course, our intention to pursue the order of the various dissertations which fill two hundred pages of double columns; but we shall advert to those which appear to us the most remarkable in point of merit and importance.

The first is upon the great questions connected with Ireland; and it is extremely able, as far as regards the composition, and highly useful in giving references to the most material parts of the evidence collected by the Committees of both Houses, during the Sessions 1824 and 1825. The defence of the Association is unanswerable, upon the three great heads of charge against it; the use of inflammatory language, the levy of money, and the interference with the administration of justice. We extract the following sound, and, though strong, yet well-founded observations, upon the first of the three.

‘By inflammatory language is, of course, meant, language calculated to excite hostility. Now, whether hostility, and the language of hostility, be blameable or not, depends upon the occasion, and the manner. Both the occasion and the manner were in this case very peculiar.

‘Here is a country of which it has been said by a Lord Chancellor—Lord Redesdale—who will not be suspected of aspiring to that character which another Lord Chancellor says, he has lived too long to have much respect for, the character of a *reformer*:—Here is a country, we say, in which a Lord Chancellor says, that there is one law for the rich, and another for the poor. Here is a people, who, having but the smallest pittance beyond what is barely sufficient to sustain life, are compelled to give up nearly the whole of that pittance to build churches and pay clergymen for about one-fourteenth part of their number: in return for which, that fourteenth part take every opportunity of expressing their hatred and contempt for those

who furnish them with money for these purposes, and their firm determination to extort as much more money from them, for other purposes of all sorts, as they can. Now then comes the Catholic Association, and, addressing itself to the thirteen-fourteenths, tells them, that all this misery and degradation is not the work of nature, but of men; powerful men, who produce it for their own advantage, who for their own advantage will continue it as long as they have power, and who therefore, as a first step to effecting any improvement, must be deprived of power. This may be called exasperating animosities; in a certain sense, it is exasperating animosities; to tell the many in what way the few have treated them, certainly has no tendency to make them love the few; and if the Catholic Association are to be tried by this standard, their cause, we fear, must be given up; as must also that of all other reformers, ancient or modern. If it be always a crime to excite animosities, it must be always a crime to expose abuses. If the exposure is to be deferred until it can be made in such language as will excite sentiments of affection and good-will towards the authors of the abuses, it would be as reasonable, and more honest, to say, that it is not to be made at all.

‘ The language of the weaker party is ever inflammatory; that of the stronger, never: because it is the stronger who is the judge. A man may rail as much as he pleases at the party which is undermost, and the language which he makes use of will not be very nicely scanned: he may inflame the passions of the powerful; he may incite those to tyrannize, who have it in their power to tyrannize; and “every thing is as it should be.” But let him address himself to the weak; let him attempt to stir them up, not to tyrannize, for that is not in their power, but to use their efforts to take from the strong *their* power of tyrannizing—and the state is going to wreck: sedition, insurrection are abroad; and one would imagine that heaven and earth were coming together.

‘ It is a mockery to tell a man that he is wronged, and to bid him at the same time feel no hostility against those who have wronged him. The proper exhortation is, not to let his feelings of hostility overcome his reason, and drive him to acts of useless and wicked violence: not to wreak his vengeance upon the hay-stacks and barns of those who have acted so ill a part towards him, nor to set fire to their houses, and burn them and their families alive; but to direct all his energies to one great object, the ridding them of their mischievous power. Now, all this the Catholic Association did. It not only exhorted the people to be peaceable, but many of its enemies acknowledge, that it actually made them so.

‘ When a man has resolved to do a thing, and has it in his power, any reason will in general suffice. If the Association had not pacified the Irish, that would have been a reason for putting it down; but it did pacify the Irish; and this also was a reason for putting it down. It was discovered, that, as it had power to quell disturbances, it probably had power to raise them: and as it was probable

that it had the power, it could not but appear certain that it had the will. Upon this principle, we should be justified in throwing a man into prison, for helping a drowning person out of a river. If he had power to drag him out, he has power to push him in: so dangerous a man must not be suffered to go at large: no time must be lost in depriving him of the means of doing mischief!' pp. 610, 611.

The arguments for Emancipation are equally clear and satisfactory; but in order to differ, and, as it should seem, for the mere sake of differing with its advocates, a great abatement is attempted to be made from its advantages, by showing that they have been much overrated, and that they would not be felt by the body of the people. This is a very great mistake, both of the subject, and of the course taken by those who have treated it. No one pretends that this measure alone would remedy the countless ills under which so many bad laws and so long a course of misrule have almost overwhelmed that unhappy people. Nor is it any discovery of the writers whose work we are examining, that more, far more than Emancipation, is wanting for their redress. But all who best understand the state of the country, and all who most deeply weigh the merits of the question without any local knowledge, are agreed in thinking that this measure must be given, whatever reforms are in contemplation—that its immediate effect will be conciliation, and the restoration, rather we ought to say creation, of something like confidence in the Irish people towards England and the Government; and, above all, that it will tend to extinguish the sentiments of sectarian animosity, if not to weaken and finally efface the sectarian distinctions, so fatal to all improvement, so repellant of every advance towards a wise system of laws, or a better course of administration. It is asked, 'Why we should deem it impossible to apply remedies to the evils that most practically affect the bulk of the people, leaving the Catholic disabilities as they are?' We answer, for one reason, beside many others, but one which is quite irrefragable, and cannot be altered without changing the whole constitution of the community—Six millions of people think and believe that they have an interest in the removal of these disabilities, and we cannot deny that they have a right to it. Until you can convert them from this persuasion, it is in vain to argue that substitutes will do as well, or better. But a great object of this disquisition (and indeed of almost every other in the volume) is to show, that nobody is in the right; and that all parties are equally wide of the mark upon all subjects, except the party or sect furnishing these Essays. How happens it, we are asked, that the Catholic disabilities are treated in both

Houses of Parliament as the grand evil? The answer suggested is, that on this, as on every other subject there discussed, the great abuses almost always escape notice; and this is ascribed to the composition of those bodies, which 'affords a key to this, as it does to so many of their other peculiarities.'—'The truth is, that there is scarcely an individual in either House whose interest it is that the great abuses should be reformed. The members of both Houses belong, almost all of them, to those classes for the benefit of which all great abuses exist; and not being accountable to, nor in any other way under the influence of, that much larger class, who suffer by the abuses, they have abundant motives to uphold, and no sufficient motive to redress them.'—'This interest being common to both parties in the two Houses of Parliament, the great abuses are, in Parliamentary discussions, by a sort of tacit consent, kept out of view.'

Now, believing that there is very great corruption in some parts, and culpable negligence in other parts of the Parliament, and that many abuses are tolerated which might be removed, we, for this reason, lament to see works like this before us written in a spirit of such absurd exaggeration; because this spirit retards, instead of furthering, the correction of the abuses, and confirms the bad habits of Parliamentary men, instead of curing them. It is any thing rather than the likely way of encouraging the detection of abuse and the friends of reformation, to assert that all are equally interested in, and therefore equally friendly to, every real evil,—and only disposed to attack petty abuses, after they have magnified them for the fraudulent purpose of at once exalting their own merits and allowing the great evils to escape. Enormous taxation is no imaginary evil; extravagant waste of the public money is no imaginary evil; useless places and mere sinecures are real injuries to the wealth, and, if we might venture an allusion to what is sparingly touched upon in the pages of this volume, the liberties of the country; corruption in great departments of the State; oppressions exercised by governors abroad; official delinquencies leading to individual suffering at home:—these are not matters of light import, either as to the immediate cases, or the consequences of their impunity; attacks on the independence of the judicial character; delays and expense in the administration of justice—are evils of the highest magnitude, and most constant and pervading operation; the unwise and vexatious restrictions upon industry and the employment of capital, are most practical and wide-spreading mischiefs; the inequality and severity of the criminal law, is an evil which immediately affects the



whole security of society, and the moral character of the people; the fluctuations of the currency, the laws respecting licensing public houses, those relating to the trade in beer and spirits, the raising of money by way of lottery—are all evils of which it is hard to say whether they most nearly affect the comforts or the morals of the great mass of the people. We have not gone half through the list; we have enumerated a part only of the abuses to which the attention of Parliament has been constantly directed, by those who watch the conduct of the party in power; who have never ceased to force those subjects upon the attention of both Houses, until, upon many of them, they have obtained redress for the country. And yet we are told, that ‘all great abuses are, by a sort of tacit consent, kept out of view,’ because ‘both parties have a common interest’ in maintaining them! We say nothing of the questions upon which men still differ—Peace and War, and our Belligerent Policy—Parliamentary Reform—the Laws touching the Liberty of the Press—the Poor Laws and Tithes in England—the abuses of the Irish Church Establishment. We pass over the topics connected with Negro Slavery, the Education of the Poor, and other matters which have never been made party questions: But we may safely ask those who have the hardihood to charge all public men with breach of duty and of good faith—with screening real abuses, and only pretending to touch what they know are no serious evils—what one practical mischief they can point out more important than the bulk of those towards which the labours of the liberal party in both Houses are directed, and a part of which only we have had room to enumerate? The country know and feel that such charges are groundless; and the urging them can do no harm to those who are the objects of the attack. But it does great harm to the cause in which they, and we, and the conductors of the work before us, we feel confident, are warmly interested; because it gives confidence to our common adversaries, the enemies of all improvement and all reform, while it incalculably lessens the effect of whatever is valuable and judicious in the pages under review.\*

---

\* A misstatement occurs at p. 616—too palpable to mislead any one—but sufficiently indicative of the spirit in which some parts of this work are written. Of Mr Brownlow's avowal that he had changed his opinion, it is said, ‘Where the interests of rival parties have succeeded in rendering almost infamous the highest act of virtue perhaps which a public man can perform, we hail with joy the dawn of a better morality in the public recantation of Mr Brownlow. The manner in which that

The most elaborate, and one of the ablest of these Essays, is that upon Joint-Stock Companies, the utility of which is fully illustrated by a variety of observations upon the restraints under which capitalists are placed, by the law of partnership and the usury laws operating in conjunction; the latter restraining the profits, unless accompanied with the risks, of trade; the former preventing all limitation of the liability to those risks. The French plan of sleeping partners, with a limited liability, called partners *en commandite*, all the ostensible partners being liable to the full extent of their property, is described with the approbation which it merits, but with a statement of the inconveniences to which all extensive partnerships are liable, which are quite sufficient to prevent their formation, unless where the nature of the business either enables the partners to conduct it with very moderate profits, or requires more capital than a few individuals can furnish; and in either case the public gains by the speculation.

The Dissertation on the *Quarantine Laws* possesses very great merit indeed. The question of Contagion is discussed in a most masterly style; and the demonstration is so complete as to set at rest, we should think for ever, the doctrines which have been so idly ventilated upon this momentous subject. It seems hardly credible that men should have been found to recommend a remission of the quarantine regulations, upon the ground of their belief in the new theory, which affirms typhus and plague to be entirely epidemic, and not capable of communication by approach, or even by actual contact. Their advice was grounded upon the expense and inconvenience occasioned to commerce by those regulations. They never seem to have reflected on the possibility that this theory might prove unfounded, and that its overthrow would be effected by the infliction of a wide-spreading pestilence. But beside that, all the facts triumphantly demonstrate its fallacy; commerce, it should seem, has already suffered no little embarrassment, from the bare promulgation of the doctrine. The concluding remarks of this admirable discourse are well deserving of attention.

---

‘recantation was received is among the most striking marks of the improving spirit of the age.’ We enter not here into the great argument respecting party; but this statement is not founded in fact; it is not true that any one avowing a change of opinion, such as Mr Brownlow’s, was ever reckoned infamous, or in any way whatever blamed by party men. The change which they reckon always suspicious, oftentimes infamous, is the very reverse of Mr Brownlow’s; it is a change from the *losing* to the *winning side*—a change not attended, like his, with risk, but rewarded by gain.

' The positive proofs which exist of the contagiousness of typhus, of scarlatina, and of plague, in certain circumstances, render it absolutely imperative on us to act, in all cases where these diseases are concerned, on the presumption that contagion may be operating. It has been abundantly proved, by a multitude of facts well known to medical men, that these contagions are often exceedingly subtle and insidious, and our vigilance should therefore be unceasing to close every avenue to their introduction, and to destroy every germ that can be discovered to exist. That England might again be visited by the plague, is undeniable. The recent example of Malta is sufficient evidence, that the exemption of nearly a century and a half, is no proof of absolute security against the possible introduction of so terrible a scourge. The devastation which a pestilence would produce in a populous country like this, where the constant intercourse between all ranks of society, and between the most distant parts of the kingdom, would conspire to spread the contagion far and wide, with unexampled celerity, bids defiance to all calculation. The quarantine regulations are our only safeguard against so tremendous a calamity. The alarm excited on the Continent, by the discussions that have taken place in this country, however unfounded, had begun to produce very serious inconvenience to our commerce; and shows us, that whatever evils may result from the shackles which the quarantine laws impose on trade, they are not to be compared with the impediments it would have to encounter, from the precautionary measures that the Continental powers would deem it necessary to resort to, if any material relaxation of those laws were to take place here. Already, at Marseilles, and at Genoa, as we are informed by Mr Canning, has a much longer quarantine been imposed on British shipping, than on that of any other nation. At Naples, in addition to the usual term of quarantine, a term of three weeks has been imposed upon British vessels that had quitted England, since the non-contagionists have been so busily promulgating their opinions. We cannot therefore but agree with him in the wish, that if experiments on the question of the contagiousness of the plague are to be carried on, they should be tried and exhibited, as such experiments anciently were, *in corpore viti*, rather than upon the interests and commercial pursuits of a great nation, or upon the safety and the lives of millions of our population.' pp. 803, 804.

The length of the dissertations in general bears no proportion to the space which these subjects occupied in the Debates of the Session. Thus, while the subjects of Joint-Stock Companies, Cruelty to Animals, and the Quarantine Laws, occupied a most inconsiderable portion of the Session—the whole debates upon these three questions being comprised in 22 pages of the Reports—they are the subjects of three very long Essays, the only three indeed of great length, except that on Irish Affairs and Negro Slavery:—for they occupy not less than 60 pages. That

on Irish Affairs fills 23—the debates extending through 252. But the grants to the Royal Family—the Building of Palaces—the Increase of the Army Pay—the Treatment of Sir R. Wilson—the question of Flogging, the debates on which extend over a greater space than Joint-Stock Companies, Quarantine Laws, and Cruelty to Animals, and are surely not less important in a general view, or less interesting in themselves, are passed over in the dissertations without a single word of observation or comment. We mention this, rather to complain of the omissions, than to blame the length of the dissertations which are inserted. Two of these we have already spoken off; that on Cruelty to Animals possesses also very great merits—especially the latter and more learned part of it. The first part is liable to the remark which we have already made, and which seems peculiarly applicable to all the discussions upon questions of jurisprudence—the authors have a disposition somewhat akin to Jealousy of all who tread on the same ground. Every thing is ignorance and error which drops from every other quarter; in short, the ground must not be trodden by any but themselves; and then, if the Legislature leaves it untouched, straightway comes the charge of doing nothing to better the condition of the people, of leaving all real evils out of sight, and only making sham fights about empty trifles, with sounding names. This soreness and jealousy breaks out, in a somewhat ridiculous way, in what is said on Cruelty to Animals, and in a more reprehensible shape, upon a far more important question, the Abuses in Chancery. We should ill discharge our duty, if we did not express very plainly what occurs to us on both these points; and in rendering justice to those unfairly charged, we shall at the same time bring to the knowledge of those who have planned and patronized this important and well meant work, the worst defect in its execution.

The paper upon Cruelty to Animals, begins with stating the importance of ascertaining the true principles of legislation upon this subject, and professes to lay down certain fundamental positions, to show that these afford the only sure guide to the lawgiver—to try by them the various measures proposed—and to examine, by the same test, what has been said in Parliament. The cases in which interference can be desired, are somewhat ostentatiously classified, being those in which animals are used for food or clothing—those in which they suffer for our amusement—those in which they suffer through our wantonness and passion—and those in which they suffer for the advancement of knowledge. To these cases the fundamental principle is applied; no little pa-

trade being used in announcing it, and some feeling of superiority betrayed, over all, or almost all, the rest of mankind, who are ignorant of it, and though compassion might have been more becoming towards their hapless lot. What then is this great and important truth? It is merely, that brutes have no rights, and that, in restraining the exercise of man's power over them, we should only act with a view to the rights and the interests of man—the only subject of human legislation. This seems really as near a truism as may be. Yet only hear what a noise of self-gratulation the statement (and somewhat prolix and superfluous demonstration of it) occasions.

‘Here and here only, the legislator is on solid ground: yet this principle has not hitherto been recognised; and it is singular that every attempt at legislation on this subject which has hitherto been made, has proceeded on the very opposite assumption. Every positive enactment, every one of Mr Martin's bills, almost every thing which has been said upon the subject in Parliament, proceeds upon the principle that the legislator is quite within his province, and is performing a function which strictly belongs to him, when he legislates for the protection of brute animals, and when he contemplates their good alone. We maintain that all legislation on this principle is absurd and vicious; that the constitution, or the protection of the rights of human beings, ought to be the sole object of human legislation; that no reason can be assigned for the interference of the legislator in the protection of animals, unless their protection be connected, either directly or remotely, with some advantage to man; and that, therefore, that advantage constitutes the real and the only ground for the legislator's interposition.’

But this is not all. The tendency of cruelty towards animals being the encouragement of cruel propensities, and therefore detrimental to society, is stated as the only ground of protecting animals; and we will venture to say, no other ground has been taken by the advocates for the prohibition. Yet see how exultingly their ignorance of this ‘*fundamental principle of legislation*’ is spoken of. ‘It is singular’ (we are told, p. 761), ‘that among all the members who took part in the debates on this subject *throughout the last year*, two only perceived this principle.’ And a quotation is given from one speech, prefaced by these words,—expressive of some surprise that any one in the House of Commons should really have had so much knowledge of ‘*the principle*.’—‘In the debate, March 11th, Mr W. Smith appears to understand it clearly; and *seizes*, as an illustration of his argument, the very fact to which we have adverted’ (the Spanish bull-fights). No doubt he does,—and

no doubt '*we*' took the '*very fact*' from his speech! Sir F. Burdett has, it seems, 'a still more distinct' perception of the great truth, and even 'states it as a principle.' We are then told, after a quotation from his speech (which is far clearer, and goes more directly to the matter than any thing in the long dissertation before us), 'In these few words, the true principle which ought to have guided the Legislature, is stated in a clear and scientific manner, and, with the exception of that part of Mr W. Smith's speech which we have quoted, they constitute *the only good sense* relative to this part of the subject which was delivered in the House, *in all the discussions* that took place upon it, *from the beginning to the end of the Session.*' (p. 762.) And after accusing one speaker of confusion of ideas, and of ignorance of the distinction between different kinds of sport, and stating another ground for restraining certain practises (bull-fights, &c.), viz. that they collect dissolute characters, and are a nuisance, it is said, 'We have searched through all the reports of the debates on the subject, from the beginning to the end of the Session, with the special purpose of ascertaining what was said in answer to these statements;' and no answer being found, the inference is, that they are unanswerable; which is thus courteously stated, after naming four members who took that side—and yet said nothing, 'They have nothing to say; and in this instance, as if by a miracle, they are conscious of it.'

Now, we believe no one who reads these passages, without at the same time referring to the Debates themselves, could fail to suppose, *first*, that the subject had been often debated '*throughout the Session*,' and that many members had borne a part in the discussions; *secondly*, that all who supported Mr Martin's bill, with the exception of Sir F. Burdett and Mr W. Smith, had supported it through '*ignorance of the principle*,' upon the ground of brutes having some rights, and of the Legislature being called to protect them for their own sakes, and not with a view to the interests of human society. Both these things are not so much implied, as stated; they are obviously the grounds of a charge, more than insinuated, of general ignorance and stupidity, and all manner of intellectual inferiority, in the bulk of those who compose the two Houses. Both the statements are, however, the very reverse of the truth; and have their existence only in the self-complacency and assumed superiority of the gifted few who pretend to have *discovered* the '*great fundamental principle*,' after one Member had stated it '*as a principle*,' and who illustrated its application by '*the very fact*' which another had previously '*seized*'

'upon,' for the same purpose. The fact stands thus, as the reader may perceive, by turning to p. 546 of the volume. The whole debates on the subject, to which these observations can possibly apply, are two; the one upon the 24th February, the other upon the 11th March. On the 16th March, Lord Grosvenor presented a petition, which gave rise to no discussion; no other person spoke, and Lord Grosvenor did not approve of Legislative interference. On the 24th March, Mr Martin moved for leave to bring in a Bill, amending a former act; and he made two other attempts, which were resisted, on the ground that the law already punished offences as felonies, which he wished to treat as misdemeanors. On these three occasions, all who spoke were against the measure, and there was no argument whatever in favour of preventing cruelty. Indeed, there could have been none, as Mr Martin was wholly unsupported; and the sweeping remarks to which we have referred, plainly do not apply to Mr Martin, but to those who supported his measures. Therefore, the whole debates 'throughout 'the last year,' and 'all the discussions from the beginning 'to the end of the Session,' are reduced to two debates, the one at the beginning, and the other at the end, of one fortnight of the Session. Those two debates, moreover, are extremely short: one occupies exactly two pages, and the other not quite three, of the Reports. What then becomes of '*all the Members*, except Sir F. Burdett and Sir W. Smith, who took 'part in the debates throughout the year' (that is, the hour, or hour and a half, twice in one fortnight)? Why, they amount to exactly three, exclusive of Mr Martin,—that is, Mr Buxton and Mr Butterworth the first night, and Sir J. Mackintosh the second. The four others who spoke, were against the measure.

But at least, it will be said, those three members, Sir J. Mackintosh, and Messrs Buxton and Butterworth, must have displayed the most deplorable ignorance of the 'great fundamental 'principle,' and argued the question upon the ground, now discovered to be so fallacious, of brutes having rights, and of law-givers having duties towards them, independent of all regard to the interests of human society; at least all those members must have handled the argument, without any reference to the effects of cruelty to animals, in depraving the human character, and contaminating the manners of men—or to the injurious influence of bear-baits, bull-baits, &c. upon the morals of human society—or to the benefits derived by mankind from sacrificing the ease and happiness of the lower animals. Strange as it may seem, these are the very grounds upon which '*all the Mem-*

'bers,' without any exception, support the measure; and we can find no other grounds than these, urged by any one of them, unless a *casual* remark of Mr Martin, in another debate, may be thought to recognise some right in brutes. But the footing upon which that gentleman distinctly propounds his Bill, for the abolition of bear-baiting, and other cruel practices, is, 'that nothing was more conducive to crime than such sports—that they led the lower orders to gambling—that they educated them for thieves—and that they gradually *trained them up for bloodshed and murder*;' and he inveighs against persons in a higher station, and better educated, for 'propagating by their example, (in attending bull-baits, &c.) *feelings of cruelty and bloodshed* among their inferiors.' (p. 546.) Mr Buxton supported the bill, because Mr Martin's former measure 'had already produced a beneficial and extraordinary *change in the manners of the lower orders.*' Mr Butterworth, without entering into the discussion of the measure itself, but following Mr Buxton on the same side, and therefore, it may be presumed, adopting his view of the subject, expresses a hope that 'the powers of the bill may be extended to the *savage, abominable, unchristian practice of prize-fighting.*' (p. 547.) Sir J. Mackintosh, professing himself averse 'to petty, trifling, and vexatious legislation,' expressly defends the present bill from that imputation, 'because in it the *moral welfare of the lower orders* was deeply concerned;' and he defends at great length, and in a manner which the learned author of the latter part of the dissertations seems highly to approve of, the experiments of a learned anatomist, who had been attacked by Mr Martin,—resting the defence of such experiments upon their utility to man, although at the expense of some infliction of pain upon the lower animals. (p. 548.)

In another article, (the remarks on the *Suttees*), a similar instance of injustice may be observed—arising less, we believe, from any actual purpose of misrepresentation, than from that overweening assumption of superiority, and consequent blindness towards the merits of others, and the determination to undervalue whatever is actually done, by the stale objection, that something much better and more important might have been done. After stating the difficulties of interfering to prevent the burning of Hindoo widows, we are told that 'it may fairly be asked, whether those members of the House, whose imaginations seem so deeply affected, by this distant, irremediable, and comparatively small amount of suffering, might not employ their time and faculties better, by attempting to remove the causes of misery prevailing to an enor-



'mous extent in their own country, and for the removal of 'which little more is requisite than a moderate portion of disinterestedness.' We naturally from this inferred, that the 'short discussion' on the *Suttees*, (as our authors admit it to have been), which had been, nevertheless, 'employing the time and 'faculties' of members to the postponement of other and more pressing subjects, was brought forward by some gentlemen remarkable for not employing that time and those faculties upon 'the misery prevailing in their own country.' Upon turning to the Reports we find, that the discussion arose upon the presentation of a petition, and that the members who took the lead in it, were Mr Hume and Mr Buxton—the former less than any man exposed to the charge of not attending to practical evils and abuses at home—the latter more remarkable in public life for nothing, than for his devotion of his 'time and faculties,' to the amendment of our Criminal Law, and the improvement of Prison Discipline; which we presume may be admitted to come within the description of 'causes of misery prevailing in our own country.' At least the authors of the volume before us seem all through to regard the class to which these subjects belong, as almost the only one deserving of serious attention—certainly as paramount in importance to all others; and this brings us to the remarks upon the Court of Chancery.

These are very short; because the 'exhaustive examination' of the subject is deferred; but it is of course deemed necessary, 'in the mean time, to express regret at the manner in which it 'has been handled in Parliament,'—and therewithall we have a most bitter attack upon Mr Williams, who, after being pronounced wholly ignorant of the subject, 'manifestly incompetent to the task he had undertaken,' and extremely ill advised in every step he pursued, and, it is needless to add, (for all are so who presume to touch upon legal questions), 'one 'who has thought very little, or to very little purpose,' on such matters, is declared to 'have done harm rather than good,' though with 'excellent intentions;' and, adds the candid and discreet writer, 'we cannot help praying that the business may \ fall into abler hands.' (p. 753.)

The detail of the objections to Mr Williams, and those who acted with him in the great and most useful warfare which he has waged against the Chancery abuses, exhibits in part only, signal want of sense and confusion of ideas; but in part also, so great a want of candour, as would lead the reader to suspect the good faith of the writer, if the extravagances could ever be forgotten, into which men are often led by overweening self-conceit. We regard those who thus inveigh against the most

honest, able, and undaunted enemies of abuses, as among the effectual friends of those abuses. We shall therefore show how these charges against Mr Williams are sought to be supported.

It seems he has not perceived where the real fault lay. The whole system is wrong, and the 'evil can never be cured but by a total change of it.' The Courts must proceed by having the parties examined before them. District as well as metropolitan Courts of Chancery must be established; and this cannot be done with 'any good effect, until our laws shall have 'been remodelled into an accessible and intelligible code.' Therefore a code must be 'compiled for their uniform guidance.' This, one should think, large enough in the way of change; but this is not by any means enough; the district courts must be courts of all work, as well as of equity; for our author 'cannot forbear expressing an opinion, that under (meaning *in*) an improved judicial system, every court ought to have cognisance over ' (meaning *of*) every kind of cause, and that the distribution of 'the tribunals should be purely local, without any metaphysical division of jurisdictions.' But 'this is a topic upon which 'Mr Williams has evidently thought very little, or thought 'to very little purpose.' It may be so; and yet he may have thought as much, and to as good purpose, as those who 'cannot forbear expressing such an opinion;' for it appears to have struck them just as they were writing the sentence. However, it must certainly be admitted, that nothing of all this has been attempted, or probably dreamt of. Therefore we are told, that 'the outcry which has now been made, will only occasion some 'trifling curtailment of Chancery proceedings, diminishing the 'whole load of evil, in the proportion of five out of a hundred.' Let us here, in all humility, venture to ask, how great a percentage of the evil would have been removed, had Mr Williams taken the sound and rational course, pointed out by this eminently judicious and practical writer—that is, had he moved for leave to bring in a Code, and then for a bill to divide the kingdom into districts, and plant a Court of Chancery in each of them? Suppose a man could have been found to second such a motion, how many in the hundred would have voted for it? and what fraction of one per cent. is so small as to express the amount of the reform that he would have carried, after a lifetime of such attempts, in a House of Commons constituted as the present is, with such a House of Lords to revise its decisions?

But then we are told, that at least he might 'have brought 'forward the details of the present state of Chancery procedure. 'Yet in this point he has failed, as signally as in every other.'

What should he have done? The answer of the omniscient essayist is ready. 'There is not a town or hamlet, there is scarcely a family possessed of any property, that is not more or less involved in the vortex of this dreadful tribunal: day after day multiplies the number of victims; and a large return might annually be made of those who actually die of protracted hope, disappointment, and even starvation, which might have been prevented by the acquisition of property withheld from them by the ruinous delays of the Court: thousands of cases might be brought forward which have lasted from ten to twenty years, and upon each of which from ten to twenty thousand pounds has been expended.'

This is the very accurate, distinct, and practical statement of what he should have done, 'in every town, hamlet, and family.' But what did he? 'With such a mass of undeniable suffering to choose from, he brings forward in his last speech five cases, none of which are aggravated, and nearly the whole of which admit of explanation and answer, if not of complete exculpation; thus enabling the Solicitor-General to make a plausible statement in vindication of the proceedings in Chancery,' and 'exposing himself to an unexcusable defeat.' Mark here the candour of referring to these five cases brought forward in Mr Williams's last speech, which was avowedly an appendix to his former speech, when the strongest cases, and in the greatest number, were of course stated, and were not to be restated; and the fairness of suppressing the fact, that the five cases brought forward, were *five petitions from individuals to the House*, complaining of the delays and expense of Chancery in their individual instances; and that Mr Williams's motion consisted merely in laying these petitions upon the table, which he was bound to open the contents of before he brought them up! But any one who refers to the debate will see, that nothing short of the most inveterate prejudice could induce any person to represent the explanation given of the cases as in the least satisfactory; and to speak of an inexcusable defeat, or a triumph to the defenders of the system, is manifestly ridiculous, in a case where the course taken did not pretend to put the general question in issue.

The grand objection, however, to Mr Williams is, that he attacks the Chancellor; whereas our author, by a most palpable begging of the question, says the fault lies with the system. Mr Williams is far from denying that the system has many and grievous faults; he even, in the course of his speech upon presenting the petitions, showed no very narrow-minded aversion to extensive and systematic reforma-

tion;—for he cited, with approbation, the example of France and Bavaris, where new codes had been framed: But his object, in the first instance, was to see whether, even according to the existing law, a better administration of justice might not remedy, not all the evils complained of, but that large portion of them which is of very recent growth. In the time of Lord Thurlow and Lord Rosslyn there was no arrear; the immense arrear which now so greatly adds to the delay and expense of Equity litigation, has been accumulating, notwithstanding the creation of a third Judge in Equity. Was it not then but natural and fit to consider whether this arrear was owing to the system, or the men who administer it? And how could this point possibly be examined, unless by investigating the Chancellor's judicial conduct? The writer, who so effectually screens the Chancellor, and indeed the system, disposes of this at once, by saying, that 'no human power could administer justice under such institutions as now exist.' But the true question is, whether or not human power could do it *as well now as they did five-and-twenty years ago*—those powers being increased by one half since 1813? But why not inquire into the conduct of the individual Judge? Can any man of sense doubt that this is an office which, how thankless soever to any one—how perilous soever to a practising lawyer—is yet of the highest advantage to the community, and from which an honest and upright man would be ashamed of shrinking? Who that regards the freedom of inquiry, or estimates the importance of official responsibility; above all, who that values the controul of public opinion, (the only practical check known in our constitution, according to the oftentimes repeated doctrine of the volume before us), can, for an instant, harbour the design of recommending that inquiry should be henceforth confined to abstract points—to errors in the system—to abuses for which no one can be made answerable—while all actual delinquency, or incapacity, or negligence, is suffered to go free, even from comment and examination, for fear of pressing hard upon an individual high in office, and powerfully connected? From the tendency of the remarks so often made in the work before us against men out of office, the uncharitable construction not unfrequently put upon their motives, the lavish praises of those in place, (some of whom, we are confident, will reject applauses bestowed so unfairly), the manifest disposition to find all that they do right if possible, and to suppress any acknowledgment of merit in those who have done all for the cause of liberal opinions that men not in power could effect—(an incense which we are well assured is of far too mean a kind to find favour in the quarter it is intended

for) \*—we are led to harbour a suspicion that, in the estimation of some few, though we trust a very few liberal minded men, they only deserve the gratitude of their country who will not consent

---

\* For specimens of such unfairness, compare the treatment of a Chancellor for the time being, with that of an Ex-Chancellor, on whom the most unmeasured abuse is lavished, for saying a few words in favour of the Corn Laws, very erroneously, we admit, but exactly to the effect of all the arguments used on that side of the question. (p. 705.) ‘Profound ignorance and weakness’—‘monstrous ground’—‘oak and triple brass round his breast’—‘babbling anilities,’ are the phrases applied to the aberrations of a ‘late Chancellor of Ireland.’ When a present Chancellor goes astray, ‘we incline to hope that his Lordship has been misrepresented.’ (p. 726.) When a Prime Minister errs, the remark is, ‘to such inconsistencies may even good and able men be reconciled.’ (746.) Does Mr Hobbhouse use a strong form of expression against the Assessed taxes? They who certainly should feel some charity towards hyperbolical figures, inasmuch as they seriously, and not rhetorically, assert the Game-laws produced more ‘human misery, than any amusement the great have ever pursued, war not excepted,’ (p. 759.) at once charge the speaker with either not being in earnest, but ‘indulging in a piece of unmeaning Parliamentary declamation,’ or ‘with attributing the greatest possible degree of mental imbecility to the gentlemen of this kingdom, or to the audience he was addressing.’ (p. 670.) When the errors of a Chancellor of the Exchequer are to be tenderly and respectfully pointed out, the statement is prefaced by a general panegyric—he is ‘one of the ablest and most upright Ministers this country ever had, one who has already done more good than all his predecessors put together.’ (p. 237.) And to go no further than Mr Williams’s motion, the grand objection is, that he does not attack the system, by laying the axe to the root; and for this he is charged with doing more harm than good—desired to quit the premises—warned off the ground of judicial reform—while a Secretary of State is lauded for ‘his magnanimity and integrity,’ and promised ‘a more certain and durable celebrity, than the heaven-born Minister, with all his wars, and all his prodigality,’ (754–5.)—principally for introducing into a bill, originally brought in without it, the application of the ballot to the choosing of Special Juries—a very great improvement, we certainly admit, and which reflects the highest credit on its author. But if Mr Williams had suggested it, and moved for leave to bring in a bill to this effect, we can scarcely doubt that the writers of these Essays would have said he was doing nothing, or worse, and preventing the real evil from being exposed and put down—the real evil being a trial of political offences, or indeed any offences by Special Juries at all—to which, all the friends of liberal principles have uniformly objected, both in debates, and in the measures they have propounded.

to serve her out of place. With all our disposition to believe in the entire good faith of these writers, we own there meet us ever and anon staggering passages—the vituperation of Mr Williams for attacking the Chancery and the Chancellor, manfully, and with an eloquence and effect seldom surpassed, as his adversaries were fain to allow, is a passage of this description. But who can read the reasons given, or affected to be given, for not mixing the merits of the individual in the discussion of the question, without having his suspicions still further excited? The argument is, in a word, this. Do nothing against him, if he has never so many faults; because, the more he has, the more effectually will he thereby expose the system, and because, by attacking him, you make his connections support the system. But unless we give the words of this unparalleled passage, we shall be thought to exaggerate, or to misinterpret it.

‘Admitting all that has been insinuated, rather than proved against the present Chancellor, to be true,—admitting that he doubts more and decides less than any of his predecessors,—admitting that he aggravates all the evils of the Court over which he presides,—*for that very reason* we would wish him to preside there a little longer, not for the benefit of the suitors, but of the community at large. Such a judge, if the insinuations against him be true, *is of infinite service* in drawing general attention to the inseparable vices of the system. With a view, therefore, to reform the Court of Chancery, we cannot perceive any advantage to be gained by attacking the Chancellor; and we are sure that such a course is attended with many disadvantages. It diverts the public attention from the great defects of the system, to a mere squabble about the merits or demerits of an individual, and it arms against the cause of improvement, the numerous and powerful friends of the Chancellor, including the ministry for the time being.’ p. 752.

Now we hesitate not to affirm, that if such doctrine as this should ever become prevalent; if a considerable portion of the community should act upon this principle, and in the vain hope of disarming the hostility of powerful individuals, and ‘ministers for the time being,’ and, obtaining their support to certain speculative improvements, cease to watch official delinquency with a jealous eye, there is an end of all purity in the administration of public affairs; and the only effective safeguard against arbitrary power is removed. The worst of ministers and of princes may fearlessly run the course of misgovernment, and encroachment towards corruption and despotism itself, and escape all censure, by only gratifying us from time to time with a change or two in some branches of our juridical or commercial policy, which may, to an indefinite extent, be altered for the better, without any sacrifice on the part of the Government,

while the grossest misrule is all the time flourishing, undisturbed by the breath of popular condemnation. This is a topic too extensive to be handled here; we have perceived of late, with some alarm, the leaning of a few well meaning and liberal men towards the heresy we have referred to. Their zeal for certain reforms blinds them to the dangers they must encounter on their path towards them, if they quit the high, broad, open, constitutional road to improvement, and consent to seek it in the dark and winding byways of Court favour or official support. To assert, for instance, that the existing system is so bad, and would authorize so many wrongs, that they who administer its powers are to be gratefully thanked for not doing even more mischief than they are accused of—What is this but to give every man in power a *carte blanche* for all manner of abuses, and not only to give him a full license for whatever wrongs he may commit, but praise for whatever he may omit to do? Yet this wholesome recipe for the establishment of despotism, has actually found some propagators amongst us, and not as a mere speculative principle, but in its application to particular instances. Mr Horne Tooke thanked Mr Addington for bringing in the bill which disqualified him for being reelected; ‘because,’ said he to the wondering Minister, ‘if you had moved *to have me hung up in the Lobby*, it would have been carried by the same majority.’ What he said in jest, some men have been found willing to act upon in sober earnest; and as the worst possible mischief must always be an imaginary point, no official misconduct or deficiency can ever, in the eyes of such men, be without its excuse, and even eulogy. Strange that such a blunder should be committed by any class of reasoners!—but passing strange to find it claimed for their own by the men who reject as inefficacious all the checks over the conduct of our rulers which the constitution affords, excepting only the influence of public opinion. Of a truth, such doctrine can lead but to one of two results, if it become prevalent—absolute impunity to all public functionaries, or a speedy overthrow of the whole existing system;—and, as the latter seems quite out of the question, pray we that the new light may be extinguished, before it marshals the way to the former consummation!

---

NOTE.

We have purposely abstained from entering into the consideration of Party connexions, which appear to be the object of such hatred

to the authors of this volume. They fall into the ordinary error of forgetting, that whether we please or no, one party always exists, held together by the ties of place, and paid out of the public purse—namely, the Government and its supporters ;—and the whole drift of their arguments is, to give that party the monopoly of all the strength derived from such associations. But it is a singular fact, that by far the most prejudiced and declamatory invectives ever urged against party, and by far the most dangerous doctrines ever broached in favour of uncontrolled power, should proceed from those who assume the character of rigorously philosophizing inquirers. The manner in which Mr Bentham's Fallacies are applied to the favourite purpose of attacking the '*Outs*,' (as they are *philosophically* termed), must, we should think, afford little satisfaction to any unprejudiced person. Thus, '*men, not measures*,' (p. 26) is said to be a tenet of the *Outs*, 'who would imply by it that good government can never be attained by any measures of their opponents ;' and that, therefore, it is not only allowable, but commendable for a member of the *Outs* to speak or vote against a measure of the *Ins*, although he may deem the measure itself beneficial ; or to support a measure of the *Outs*, although he may deem it pernicious.' And then come scurrilous invectives on the '*gross improbity*' of such conduct, and the '*impudent pretensions*' of a set of men, who would persuade us 'that they alone are exempted from the common incident of humanity, the disposition to prefer self to others.' Suffice it to say, that no men ever did set up such silly pretensions, or act upon such wicked principles : But, that the State would gain by having its affairs in the hands of men whose opinions are sound, and who would go along with, instead of struggling against, the improved intelligence of the age, is a proposition hardly requiring any proof ;—nor did any one ever hear of a party in opposition maintaining, that when they got into power, they 'might be trusted without the establishment of those checks, the absence of which enables the *Ins* to do so much mischief.' For the power of providing such checks has been exactly the object which the *Outs* had in view, when they said that a change of men was wanted. As often as they have obtained power, they have begun to provide them ; and been only hindered from effecting their purpose by the alarms of the Court, and their own consequent dismissal. Then we are told, that the *Outs* oppose every thing ; and 'when a measure is so clearly beneficial that specific objections cannot be found, the only hope of depriving the *Ins* of the credit they are likely to obtain, is by an attempt to reject the measure altogether, on pretence of a regard for economy, or by denouncing it as a job ; that is, fraught with advantage to some assignable individual ; or as likely to increase the influence of the Crown.' (p. 27.)

A great deal more is said to the same purpose ; but as there is no truth in the charge, no instances are given. Yet it seems pretty clear, from what follows towards the end of the volume, that the objections to



the County Courts Bill were chiefly in the eye of those who penned this page 27.—‘The only hope of depriving the *Ins* of the credit!’ Can these writers be ignorant that Lord Althorp was the sole author of the Bill? Can they affect to think him one of the *Ins*? But does not the whole conduct of the Opposition, ever since any disposition towards a liberal policy was evinced by any part of the Government, give the most positive contradiction to all these unworthy invectives, and still worse insinuations? We allude, not to the transactions of the last Session, because the authors of this work may say that they had written it before. But have not the liberal part of the Ministers, and the body of the Opposition, been cooperating heartily, for years past, on some of the most important questions? On others, have not the Opposition been faithfully discharging their duty, and forcing the Government into a right line of conduct? In this, they have owed their great success mainly to the support which they have received from public opinion; and such writings as we have here been commenting upon, are obviously intended to deprive them of this support—partly by direct charges, and partly by a very careful suppression of all reference to the services rendered by them. We fully expect to see the reform of the Criminal Law ascribed to the Government, without the least allusion to Sir S. Romilly or Sir J. Mackintosh. This would certainly be a less revolting injustice than the Westminster Review was lately guilty of—when, in order to pay court in certain very high quarters, and to inflict pain upon the surviving relatives of a gentleman long since deceased, its Editors, probably deceived by some interested individual, did not scruple to publish private letters, which must have been obtained directly from a woman of abandoned character. Had that gentleman and those relatives been of the party in power, no such outrage upon decency would have been committed;—and had the Opposition abandoned their principles, by preferring the possession of place to the discharge of their duty, they would have as certainly escaped these attacks, as they would the scurrility of the ministerial press. In the honest intentions of those Editors we have great confidence—as we have in those of the conductors of the work before us—however much we may lament their passing errors;—and believing them to have been imposed upon, we take leave merely to request that they would keep their eye upon the quarter from whence proceeded the scandalous article to which we have alluded—and observe whether any benefit is derived from it.

---

ART. IX. *Letters on the Church.* By AN EPISCOPALIAN. 8vo. pp. 192. London, 1826.

WE have been suspected, we know, of being unfriendly to the Church of England. But we are not—at least on

the present occasion. The causes which led to her great Reformation, we think indeed should still reform her more; and, with the fullest sense of the general soundness of her doctrines, and the benefits which her establishment has conferred on the community, it is impossible to look back to the history of that Reformation, or round to the spread of Sectarianism, and the infinite changes which have since been wrought on the whole frame of our society, without feeling that things may then have been necessary which are now prejudicial—and that much might be adopted in a hurried experiment which it would be improper to retain in a mature institution.

The subject is familiar enough in the mouths both of capable and incapable talkers:—but in reality it is little in their thoughts—nor do we hesitate to say, that we do not know any other, of nearly equal importance, on which the public mind is so ill informed, or to which it has been so little accustomed to direct a calm and scrutinizing attention, as the constitution of the Church of England by law established. The author of the work before us is entitled therefore to our best thanks, for the vigorous effort which he has made to arouse this indifference, and to enlighten this ignorance. He has spoken out boldly, but yet temperately; and although we are far from agreeing with all his doctrines, we think that both the ability and the good spirit with which he writes are excellently fitted to open, with the happiest omens, that discussion which it is evidently his object to provoke.

The scope and object of his book may be stated in a single sentence. It is, to prove that all Religious Establishments, by which one particular form of worship is especially protected and favoured by the civil government, and in return is entirely subjected to its control, are at once contrary to the interests of religion and to those of civil society; that the consequences of what is called the Alliance of Church and State are mischievous alike to *both* parties; that a State, as such, ought to be of no religion at all; and that therefore it ought not to identify itself with one sect, and to tolerate all others; but to protect all, and prefer, and discountenance, none.

The importance, at least, of these propositions will be readily admitted—if we consider for a moment some of the many changes that would result from their practical adoption. In the *first* place, there would be an end of that phrase which is so familiarly used in the southern part of this island,—‘the Constitution in Church and State.’ The King would no longer be the head of the Church; he would cease to possess the appointment of its bishops; nor would its faith and wor-

ship be any longer regulated and enforced by Act of Parliament. On the other hand, the ears of our Presbyterian countrymen would be no more scandalized by the expression of 'Lords Spiritual,' in the preamble of every statute enacted by the Legislature; Bishops, as such, would have no seats in Parliament; Test and Corporation Acts, Acts of Indemnity for not complying with their provisions, even the Toleration Act itself, would all cease to exist; civil penalties would no longer be annexed to religious offences; while the Church, freed from its State connexion, might exert, without reproach or question, the undoubted privilege of every society, by excommunicating, or, in plain English, by expelling, such of its members as refused to comply with its regulations. Thus far our picture of the changes, which would follow on the practical adoption of his principles, would agree with that of the author himself. In some respects, to which we shall allude hereafter, it would indeed embrace some points which he is not inclined to comprehend in it:—but even, according to his own view, the consequences of the destruction of the Church Establishment must be allowed to be of no mean importance, whether for good or for evil.

But what, it will be asked, are the mischiefs of the existing state of things, which make, in the author's opinion, a change of such magnitude desirable? His answer is, that they are of a twofold nature—both spiritual and temporal:—that it is absolutely contrary to the commands of Christ, and to the whole spirit of his institution, and practically most injurious to the purity of his religion, either to receive the assistance of the Civil power to uphold the Gospel, or to submit to its authority in the government and internal regulation of the Church:—and that it is Politically injurious, by necessarily creating disaffection to the State in all those who dissent from the Established Church; and by introducing a system of pains and penalties, and civil disqualifications, against persons guilty of no civil crime, but only differing in religious opinion.

Now, as to the unlawfulness and mischief of enforcing spiritual censures, propagating religious truths, or punishing religious errors, by temporal pains and penalties, we cordially agree with our author. These things are contrary to the spirit of Christianity; which, though far from viewing it as a matter of indifference, whether men's opinions on the highest of all subjects are right or wrong, has yet wisely directed, that for such points they shall be tried only by Him who cannot err; partly, we may venture to imagine, from the danger of mistaking truth for error, and error for truth, amidst the falli-

bility of human judgments; and much more, because the degree of blame attaching to the holder of a false opinion is a question utterly beyond the reach of man to determine. To what extent the prejudices of education or of habit may have darkened the mind, what secret immoral bias may have indisposed it to truth, or what criminal negligence may have made it omit the proper means of discovering it, are amongst the secrets of the human heart, which are only known to Him who made it: And yet without a knowledge of these, how is it possible to determine when error is justly punishable? Or, again, with regard to that immorality of life which is noticed by spiritual censures, it has been the general practice of legislators to consider much of the evil of human conduct as lying out of their jurisdiction; and none but fanciful and inexperienced men have ever attempted to remove the more delicate and internal disorders of the moral constitution, by the coarse instrument of legal penalties. The Christian religion, far from condemning this forbearance, tends rather to confirm it. As addressing the consciences of individuals, it does indeed dwell most strongly on the sinfulness of every evil thought, word, or action;—But, lest any should mistakenly conclude, that while insisting on the guilt of these things, it meant to point them out as fit objects of legal punishment, it has expressly divested itself of all temporal sanctions; and has so clearly refused to *extend* the province of the magistrate to things hitherto not within his jurisdiction, that the Quakers, as is well known, suppose that it designed even to *narrow* it, and to forbid temporal punishments even for those offences which had been always held justly liable to them. So far, therefore, as the author means to say, that *all civil penalties* are improperly applied to merely *religious offences*, we assent entirely to what he has said in the following spirited passage:—

‘The Church of Rome has persecuted the most bitterly, and for the greatest length of time, chiefly because she has had the most, and the longest continued *power* to do so, and has existed during the ages of the greatest blindness, and ignorance, and barbarism; and it has been urged, that the right, and even the duty of persecution is one of her most fundamental articles of faith. But what Protestant Church has ever, as a body, expressly renounced that right? The Inquisition is a most horrible tribunal; and it is one well accommodated, I confess, to the genius of the Romish persuasion; but it is no necessary part of Popery; and why should it not exist in a Protestant country? What disclaimer, for instance, is there in the articles of the English Church, of all right to erect or to sanction such a tribunal? What denial of all authority in Christian Princes to restrain religious offenders by the civil sword? It is notorious that persecution, even of the severest kind, did take place under the Reform-

ers, both in Britain and in other countries. The penalties, indeed, for religious offences were before long greatly *mitigated*, and in successive ages were more and more lightened; but the question now before us is, not respecting the *severity* exercised in any instance, but the *usurpation* committed. If the civil magistrate have no rightful jurisdiction whatever in religious concerns, it is quite as much an act of *injustice*, though of far less *cruelty*, to *fine* a Socinian as to *burn* him. If, therefore, the abolition of capital, and of all excessively cruel punishments, for religious offences, had been the result of a correct view of the character of Christ's kingdom—of the distinct provinces of civil government and religion,—then of course *all* those punishments, *all* exercise of secular authority in such matters would have been abolished at the same time, and would not only have been in practice actually abolished and withdrawn, but would have been pronounced to *have been in principle all along* utterly unjustifiable. The legislature would not only have *forborne* the exercise of any such interference, but would have disclaimed and protested against any *right* in any one to exercise it: whereas, the very passing of an *act* to repeal an act of this description, implies, that however *inexpedient* the legislature may consider it, they yet regard it as valid and regular till repealed, not as null and void all along: And yet, one who acknowledges Christ, and recognises the true character and the rights of his kingdom, must acknowledge that the British King and Parliament have no more right to make or enforce laws for the government of Christ's kingdom—for the regulation that is, of Christians in their spiritual concerns, than the Bishop of Rome, or the Emperor of Russia has, to make laws for the inhabitants of Great Britain. And I need hardly add, that as no secular coercion can properly be employed towards those who are the subjects of Christ's kingdom, considered as such, *i. e.* in religious matters, so it would be utterly inconsistent with such a principle to employ force to *bring* into Christ's kingdom such as are *not* subjects of it—Pagans and Infidels. To persecute men (as the Infidel Jews and Heathens did) for *being* Christians, is a violation of the law of *natural morality*, which dictates, that no man should be punished by the civil magistrate, for any thing which is no offence against civil society; to persecute men for *not* being Christians, or for not being orthodox Christians, is, besides this, a violation also of the *law of the kingdom of Christ*, who forbade the use of violent means in his cause.

But we have seen that the author of the 'Letters' objects as strongly to the power exercised by the State in governing and controlling the Church, as to that exerted in behalf of the Church, in punishing heretics, unbelievers, and excommunicated persons with the civil sword. He insists on the profanation which religion must undergo by being made subservient to secular interests, and employed, as it so often has been, as an engine of State policy. Warburton, in his well known Treatise on the 'Alliance of Church and State,' had mentioned, among the advantages of this alliance, that 'there are peculiar con-

‘ junctures when the influence of Religion is more than ordinarily serviceable to the State, which the magistrate cannot so well improve to the public advantage, unless he have the Church under his direction, to prescribe such public exercises of Religion as the exigencies of the State require.’ On this curious argument, the author of the Letters remarks, with equal force and justice,—

‘ In plain English, the magistrate may prescribe *Te Deums* and Fasts, whenever it suits his purposes,—engage Christian ministers to preach down his political opponents,—obtain acquiescence in his measures, just or unjust, on pain of damnation,—and hurl against his enemies the terrors of the next world in addition to those of the sword. Belshazzar’s profanation of the sacred vessels of the Temple at an idolatrous feast, was nothing to this! One would think the good Bishop had forgotten on which side he was writing. If any one be convinced, by such an argument, of any thing but the *danger* to Christ’s religion, by placing it thus under the control of the civil governor, I can devise no process of reasoning that is likely to undeceive him.’ p. 102.

Nor does he omit to notice the particular ‘ State Prayers ’ and ‘ State Festivals, ’ which are enjoined in the Church of England.

‘ The regular appointed prayers for the *long life* of the King, stand in strange contrast, methinks, with the setting aside for a solemn *thanksgiving* (as you are sure, in the regular course of things, must be done), the *day of his death*, *i. e.* the day on which his successor will begin to reign. It might be suspected, not without a shew of reason, that if King William, instead of safely landing his forces on the 5th of November, had been on that day drowned in a storm, you would have been at this time solemnly celebrating that event, and repeating a form of thanksgiving to Almighty God for having a second time, on that day, overthrown in a miraculous manner a wicked and treasonable attempt on the royal House of Stuart. This I say might have been suspected, even had the Church been in all such cases left to her own discretion; but the suspicion amounts almost to a certainty, when it is considered that all these things are dictated by those in power for the time being.’ p. 123.

To the same subject belongs his complaint of the Unalterableness of the Church Liturgy and Articles; so that, as he most truly observes,

‘ The members of the Church of England are even in a greater strait than the Church of Rome, whose pretence to infallibility only, compels them to maintain, *in theory*, that each of their institutions *was* perfect at the time when it was established; whereas you,’ he continues, addressing himself to the members of the Church of England, ‘ have to maintain, *in practice*, the unerring rectitude of your own, not only originally, but *for ever*. They may say, this is *no longer* expedient; but *your* institutions are like “ the law of the Medes and Persians, which

altereth not," even after two or three centuries. For you *cannot* alter any thing *without* the cooperation of the civil power; and *with* it you are too wise to take any such steps;—lest, when once called in, it should do more than you would wish." p. 173.

Some very sensible remarks occur with regard to the English laws relating to Marriages.

' Marriage consists, in our view, of two things—a civil Contract, which makes the offspring legitimate in the eye of the law, and involves temporal obligations,—and a Vow before God. Now, with respect to the first, it ought to be competent to persons of all persuasions to form the civil contract, without any violence to their religious principles, however erroneous, and without any interference with religious rites whatever. Oliver Cromwell was right for once, in causing this civil contract to be made before the civil magistrate. Neither Jews, nor Turks, nor Christians, can object to this, if they choose to live under the laws of the land. The Magistrate, therefore, ought to certify and register the due contraction of this engagement. But as for the religious rite, that should be left to the religious community to which each person belongs. I cannot but think in the case, for instance, of the Unitarians, that there is both a species of persecution and of profanation committed. I need not tell you that I abhor the faith of the Unitarians;—so I do that of the infidel Jews and Mahometans;—but I think that none of these should be *compelled*, in order to contract a marriage, to be witnesses and partakers of a ceremony which their conscience condemns; and it is, under these circumstances, a degradation of the minister, and a profanation of the ceremony, that it should take place. \* \* \* But many of the English clergy seem to think, with Paley, that the solemnization of a marriage by a Justice of the Peace, (though without *forbidding* any previous or subsequent religious ceremony which the consciences of the parties might dictate), was calculated to degrade the clergy. They *stickle* for their exclusive right of solemnizing marriage between those who think the ceremony blasphemous, and who blaspheme the doctrines implied in it! One has scarcely patience with men who thus perversely glory in degradation. They remind me in many points of the dog in the fable, who mistook the clog round his neck for a badge of honourable distinction.' pp. 126—128.

What has been done, and what is likely to be done hereafter, with regard to the disgraceful state of things here alluded to, affords a fair sample of the pertinacity with which a certain party successfully defend every abuse in the ecclesiastical institutions of England. Once and again have the Unitarians petitioned Parliament to be allowed the indulgence, actually enjoyed by the Jews and Quakers, that of legally solemnizing their own marriages, without employing the ministers or the ritual of the English Established Church. Once and again have their petitions been rejected! One learned Prelate is reported to have said, that he would not give them credit

for any scruples of conscience about the matter !—and Parliament itself seemed to be of opinion, that it was better that their consciences should suffer violence, than that the venerable rust which, during two centuries and a half, has incrustated the institutions of the Church should be injured by any profane attempts to purify them. So the question rests for the present. But as the Unitarians will probably persevere, their individual complaint is likely in time to be listened to,—and, in the usual comprehensive spirit of our legislation, we shall have a sort of *privilegium* enacted, to redress that particular grievance—the enemies of reform gladly yielding thus far, in order to obviate a more alarming evil, the removal of abuses by a general law founded on the plain principles of wisdom and justice. Nor is their policy a bad one ; for, amidst the prevailing selfishness of mankind, general principles have little chance of finding an advocate, when once individual interests are satisfied.

In addition to the injury thus sustained by the Church, from their undue exercises of authority on the part of the State,—the author of the ‘ Letters’ maintains that the State suffers in its turn. On this point his remarks are extremely ingenious, and substantially just ;—at least they are quite sufficient to show that an Established Church, which is objectionable in many of its practices, and exclusive in its terms of communion, is necessarily a dead weight on the shoulders of any Government which supports it. Warburton had quoted these words from the Icon Basilike—

‘ Touching the government by Bishops, the common jealousie hath been, that I am earnest and resolute to maintain it, not so much out of Piety, as Policy and reasons of state. Wherein so far indeed reason of state doth induce me to approve that government above any other, as I find it impossible for a Prince to preserve the state in quiet, unless he hath such an influence upon churchmen, and they such a dependence on him, as may best restrain the seditious exorbitances of Ministers’ tongues, who, with the keys of heaven, have so far the keys of the people’s hearts, as they prevail much by their oratory to let in or shut out both peace and loyalty.’

Upon this the author of the Letters proceeds. “ Now the magistrate, by admitting and excluding to the exercise of their function such ministers as he thinks fit, has certainly a great control over the *members of that church which he so governs* ; but what influence will this give him over *Dissenters* ? *Their* ministers will have all that independent influence over *their* flocks, from which he dreads such danger to the State. But why should it be expected that this influence should be exerted in hostility to the existing government ? I see no rea-



son to apprehend this *as long as the Church is left in its original, independent condition*; but as soon as the civil magistrate identifies himself with the Church, to which Dissenters are necessarily opposed, by making himself the head of their adversaries, he himself *makes them his enemies.*" The alliance of Church and State, necessarily drives the enemies of the Church to be enemies of the State likewise; and thus occasions the very evil from which it professes to secure us. This is no imaginary case. Experience has shown that the religion of the Presbyterians is not necessarily hostile to the British constitution; but the blow which it aimed at the Church of England, in the reign of Charles I., necessarily *passed through the sides* of the regal power, *because* the regal power stood before it, as an ally. Being the *natural* enemies of the Church, they were *made* enemies of the State; and it is possible they might not have resorted to violent means, had the Church possessed no coercive power, but might have been content to employ arguments, when arguments alone were opposed to them. At any rate, they would have had no excuse for so acting; but when the Church is endued with coercive power, she loses her privilege, and must expect that coercive power will be employed against her. 'Put up thy sword into its sheath: for all *they that take the sword shall perish by the sword.*'

If therefore the magistrate would effectually preclude, instead of increasing, the danger in question, he must do his work thoroughly; he must not only prohibit, but completely extirpate, by a vigorous persecution, all religions except the one established. *Half measures* generally defeat both the objects they aim at. 'Dismiss your prisoners without ransom,' said the old Samnite to Pontius, the general who had captured a Roman army; 'if this does not please you, kill them all; and take away either their will, or their power to hurt you.' Instead of this, he made them pass under the yoke—and dismissed them ardent and implacable foes.

These evils in the existing state of things, with some others which we have not room to notice, induce the author of the Letters to wish for a total change of system. The alteration which he proposes is indeed sufficiently simple; he would remedy the mischiefs which he laments, by entirely dissolving the connection between the State and the Church. The Church should regulate its own concerns with the same freedom that is enjoyed by the Universities, and should ask of the State no other favour than that protection which a government is bound to grant to every class of its subjects. But, it may be asked, does the author seriously think that the Church will ever be

persuaded to pay the necessary price for obtaining this freedom? His answer is, that she has paid the price for it already—that from the moment the State consented to tolerate Dissenters, the terms of the alliance between it and the Church were broken,—and that the Church may now, in all fairness, pack up its goods and chattels, and remove to some freer station, where it may enjoy them, without being subject to any control.

That such a prospect is no more than the dream of a warm imagination, the author himself, we suspect, must be fully aware. He cannot possibly expect that any class of the State's servants will be allowed to resign their commissions, and yet to retain the full pay and emoluments of active service. If they talk of the profanation of being governed by secular authority, the Civil power may well reply to them, in the words of the Emperor Frederick the First, ‘*Episcoporum ego quidem non affecto hominum—si tamen eos, de nostris regalibus, nil delectat habere. Qui si gratanter audierint, Quid tibi et Regi? consequenter quoque ab Imperatore non pigeat audire, Quid tibi et possessioni?*’

But the author of the Letters denies that the clergy are to be considered as the servants of the State, or that they depend upon that character for their emoluments. ‘How the Church of England,’ he says, ‘came into possession of that property which her officers now hold, is an inquiry which may serve to amuse those who delight in antiquarian researches; but it is not relevant to the present question. The actual right of the Church to her property is founded, (like that of individuals to their’s) ‘in Possession.’ (p. 136). The shallowness of this, however, is obvious. Possession may do much for individuals; but when it is pleaded *in behalf of an order*, the question must always be, by what titles and what authority that order is constituted. ‘The right of *the Church* to her property,’ says the author,—but of what Church?—Of the Church of England? But is it not plain, that from the moment that the national establishment is dissolved, there must cease to be any Church of England? Who ever heard of the Church of the United States of America? There might be an Episcopal Church of the Thirty-nine Articles in England; but on what grounds such a society, however learned and respectable, could pretend to claim property provided only for the National Church of England, we must leave to others to discover.

But let us suppose, for an instant, that the Episcopalians of the Thirty-nine Articles were suffered to usurp the property of the National Church, is the constitution of their sect, for such

it would then become, calculated to hold out any reasonable hope of its reforming itself, when released from the control of Parliament? We rather think, that as soon as it was no longer supported by the laws made by Parliament for its direction, it would instantly fall to pieces. For where would the power of legislating for it exist? In the two Houses of Convocation? or in the Synods of the provinces of Canterbury and York? Or would the Bishops assemble to hold a new Provincial Council? Any of these authorities might indeed fully represent *the clergy*; but all would be very unfit, in the present times, to legislate for *the Church*—of which, as Burke most truly observes, ‘*the Laity*’ is as much an essential integral part, and has as much its duties and its privileges, as the Clerical member.’ Or does the author of the Letters believe, that the clergy, already secure of the enjoyment of their revenues, would consent to the formation of a General Assembly, like that of the Church of Scotland, and thus, in some measure, restore the Church to the freedom of its original constitution? Highly as we respect many of their number, we are greatly mistaken, if they would not, as a body, shrink with horror from any such proposal. What between real conscientious scruples, and that love of power common to all men, and from which the clergy assuredly have not been more exempt than the rest of mankind, we believe that they would never allow the lay members of their Church to assist in the revision of its liturgy and articles, or to claim their just share in the general management of its concerns.

There are some, however, to whom, instead of an objection, it would be a chief motive for pressing what the author calls the Emancipation of the Church—that, in such an emancipation, the alienation of the Church revenues is necessarily involved. These persons do not wish to see the Ecclesiastical Establishment reformed, but utterly overthrown; and its abuses answer their purpose, as tending to make the existing system unpopular. To us, on the contrary, it appears a resource of the highest value, that so large a mass of property is set apart by the actual laws of England, for the promotion of the physical and moral good of the people, by means so well calculated to effect it. We would call upon Parliament not to interfere with so benevolent an object, but to strive to realize it;—to make the Church in practice what it is in theory;—to be bold and decisive in reforming, but, above all things, to shrink from subverting the institution of a regularly endowed parochial clergy. It is no ordinary national benefit, to have a number of well educated men dispersed over every part of the kingdom, whose especial business it is to keep up and enforce

the knowledge of those most exalted truths which relate to the duties of man, and to his ultimate destiny;—and who, besides, have a sort of general commission to promote the good of those among whom they are settled, in every possible manner: to relieve sickness and poverty, to comfort affliction, to counsel ignorance, to compose quarrels, to soften all violent and uncharitable feelings, and to reprove and discountenance vice. This, we say, is the *theory* of the business of a parochial clergy. That the *practice* should always come up to it, it would be utter folly to assert, or to expect: But such is the innate excellence of Christianity, that even now, amidst all the imperfections of the existing Establishment, its salutary effects are clearly felt; and in those numerous parishes, in different parts of England, in which there is no gentleman resident, the benefits of securing the residence of a well educated man, with no other trade but that of doing good to the minds and bodies of his neighbours, are almost incalculable. It should be remembered, too, that it is one natural but most unfortunate effect of the English Poor-laws, to generate harsh and unkindly feelings between the labouring classes and the farmers, by whom, in agricultural parishes, the greatest portion of the Poor-rates is paid. In many places, therefore, the clergyman stands, as it were, as a mediator between the poor and their richer neighbours, inclined to protect and relieve the one, from the beneficent spirit of his profession, yet enough connected with the other, by his own rank in society and habits of life, as to be unapt to encourage an idle and profligate pauperism.

There are other points, too, which might be mentioned, and which are not unworthy of the notice of an enlightened statesman. In retired parishes, the family of the clergyman is often a little centre of civilization, from which gleams of refinement of manners, of neatness, of taste, as well as of science and general literature, are diffused through districts into which they would otherwise never penetrate. And be it observed, that these are the very parts of the country which nothing but an endowed parochial clergy could regularly and permanently influence. In large towns, indeed, and in wealthy and populous districts, the unpaid zeal of individuals might often supply the place of a minister, appointed and maintained by public authority. But in remote country parishes, where there are no inhabitants but farmers, and one or two small shopkeepers, besides the population of day-labourers, it would most commonly be impossible to find an individual willing or qualified to undertake such high and important duties. Such districts would at the best receive only occasional visitations

from some itinerant instructor,—who certainly could ill confer all those various benefits, temporal and spiritual, which might be derived from a resident minister of only equal zeal and capacity.

These are the objects for which *we* desire to retain a religious Establishment; and which we would steadily keep in view as our best guide while reforming the actual institutions of the Church of England. It is evidently most desirable, that the Church should be completely identified with the People; that it should not only be uncorrupt, but should be generally acknowledged to be so; that while its terms of Communion were made as comprehensive as possible, so as to include conscientious members of almost every denomination of Christians, it should be most uncompromising in the standard of moral excellence, to which it required its ministers to conform; and should watch over their previous education, as well as their subsequent course of life, with the most zealous care. The reforms which we desire, would remove the evils so well represented by the author of the work before us, without involving the total destruction of the establishment, like the changes which he himself proposes. Briefly, then, but not heedlessly, we proceed to notice some points in the actual constitution of the English Church, which our very remoteness from its sphere of action has enabled us perhaps to observe more calmly, and to judge more impartially.

1. The Church of England is unpopular. It is connected with the Crown and the Aristocracy; but it is not regarded with affection by the mass of the people;—and this circumstance greatly lessens its utility, and has powerfully contributed to multiply the number of Dissenters. To this day it feels the effects of the peculiar conjuncture at which it was established. It was the child of the Civil Government, when that Government was a Despotism; and it learnt to echo the language and to copy the arbitrary proceedings of its patrons, till it shared with them the indignation of the people, and fell with them in one common overthrow. Thus the Church has never thoroughly harmonized with the popular part of our Constitution; and we have been often amused, by observing the soreness with which some English clergymen still speak of the House of Commons and its Committees—as if the terrors of the Long Parliament were still haunting their memories. This notorious spirit of Toryism would of itself tend to alienate the affections of the people from the clergy as a body; but other causes have combined to aggravate the mischief. The system of Church patronage, for instance, while it makes many of the

clergy directly dependent upon the rich and the great, makes all of them independent of popular favour; and their course of life keeps them somewhat remote from the contact of public opinion. Again, the rank which the English clergy hold in society is often prejudicial to their influence with the poor. Birth, habit and education, have identified them with the higher orders;—they share their feelings, and enjoy their pleasures; and they sometimes are ignorant, from mere inexperience, of the language and manner which are most intelligible to the common people, and most readily find the way to their hearts. Hence has arisen the peculiar unpopularity of their style and manner of preaching. It trembles to offend a cultivated taste and a critical judgment:—it is generally, therefore, free from gross extravagances, but is, beyond all other preaching, tame, and unimpressive to uneducated minds. The same character prevails in their writings;—their Tracts, intended for circulation amongst the poor, are mostly stiff, and have about them an air of lecturing and prosing, like that of a condescending superior, addressing readers almost of a different species from himself.

Other causes have their weight with the middling classes of society in indisposing them to the existing establishment. The great incomes and the pluralities enjoyed by the higher clergy cannot but appear excessive;—the difficulty of procuring places of worship, and ministers of the Established Church, to meet the increased population of the country in large towns and in manufacturing districts, argues something deficient in its actual constitution: And wherever the blame *ought* most to fall, the general impression is unfavourable to the Church, from the feeling, that while it absorbs a large part of the revenue of the country, it does not sufficiently perform its work. The old laws against Conventicles, and the inflexible strictness with which the service of the Church is confined to the prescribed forms of the Liturgy, place its ministers also at a disadvantage, when opposed to the unfettered and flexible activity of the Dissenters. Whilst any other Christian teacher may address an audience wherever he can find one, and in the language which he may judge most appropriate to the occasion, a clergyman of the Establishment may preach only within the walls of his parish Church;—nay, he may not preach there, unless he choose also to read the morning or evening prayer at the same time;—a regulation which makes it impossible to open the Churches to any purpose in country parishes, on any other day than Sunday. We are not now discussing the propriety or impropriety of these and similar regulations;—we are only asserting, that they tend to make the Church

less popular than we wish it to be:—and when it is notorious, that no steps have been taken for the last two centuries to amend or improve its institutions, it is not unnatural that it should be taxed with indolence and indifference, and with thinking more of its dignity than of its duties.

II. Unpopularity, however, is not always a sure criterion of demerit;—but we have now to notice some things in the present state of the church, which are bad in themselves, independent of any effect which they may produce on public opinion. The Church of England is Exclusive; and has, in many instances provoked the separations from it, which it affects at once to lament and to condemn. This, in a national Church, is no light evil; inasmuch as it deprives a large portion of the people of the benefits of some most important public institutions; and, so far as the Government is the supporter of the Church, it makes a number of persons dissatisfied and discontented with the Government also. To be a public minister of religion must be an office sought after by some of the purest and best men in the country;—and it is to be lamented that any of this description should, without the clearest necessity, be forbidden to aspire to it. Nor can those who most admire the public schools and universities of England, represent it very consistently as no grievance to be excluded from all participation in their benefits.

But the Church of England has been apt to congratulate itself on its tolerant and liberal spirit, because it does not ask for the direct infliction of pains and penalties upon Dissenters, nor that they should be deprived of the liberty of forming distinct societies of their own. No doubt, this is liberality, when compared with the conduct of the Church in former times. It is a wonderful improvement on the persecutions of Parker and Whitgift, on the language of the Canons of 1608, \* and the Synods of 1640. † It is certainly less odious

---

\* We might quote, in proof of this, every one of the 12 Canons of the very first chapter or division, entitled, ‘*De Ecclesiâ Anglicanâ*,’ all of which denounce excommunication, *ipso facto*, on persons maintaining the several opinions there condemned. And if we turn to the 65th Canon, we shall find that the Church earnestly desired to see its excommunications enforced by the Civil magistrate’s writ ‘*De Excommunicato capiendo*,’ by which the person of the offender was consigned to prison. It should be particularly observed, that the 5th Canon condemns to excommunication all those who should affirm that *any one* of the 39 Articles was, in *any part*, erroneous! Could the Pope himself have done more?

† These Synods were held at London and York, and consisted of the Bishops and Clergy of both provinces—of Canterbury and York. Their

in a Government to allow those who complain of its tyranny to emigrate peaceably, than to shut up every door against their escape, and then to subject them to fine, imprisonment, and death? But if we were to see nearly half the inhabitants of any country preferring a voluntary banishment to a longer abode in their native land, we should not be much inclined to hold up the Government of such a nation as a pattern of mildness and liberality. And here it seems to us, that the author of the 'Letters' has done the Civil power injustice, when he complains of its imposing a Liturgy and Articles upon the Church by its secular authority. On the contrary, the error of the Civil power in England has been to receive and sanction, much too passively, the Articles which the Clergy have tendered to its acceptance. When the House of Commons, in the reign of Elizabeth, delayed for some time to pass the Act to legalize the Articles of Religion submitted to them by the Bishops, Archbishop Parker expressed his displeasure at this hesitation—as if religion were a matter in which they had no right to exercise their own freedom of judgment. Nor can it be doubted that Parliament, at almost any period of our history since the Reformation, would have readily consented to any alterations in matters purely spiritual, which the Bishops and the great body of the Clergy might have recommended to be made. We repeat, therefore, that the needless multiplication of terms of conformity, which has caused so large a portion of the people to dissent from the Church of England, is principally, and almost entirely the fault of the Clergy; and that the Civil Power is only to be blamed for sanctioning too negligently whatever they thought proper to frame.

---

Canons are 17 in number, and subjoined to them is the Royal Assent, fully approving and ratifying all their provisions. The third Canon is directed against Popery; and, amongst other things, it strictly enjoins that the children of Popish recusants shall be brought up by Church of England schoolmasters, in the doctrine of the Church of England, notwithstanding the prohibition of their parents: and if the parents should then take away the children from the school, their names should be given up to the Bishop of the diocese, who was to return them to the Judges at the Assizes, to be punished according to the Statutes. And the fifth Canon specially makes all the penalties and proceedings enacted against the Roman Catholics applicable to all Protestant Dissenters, or to any persons who should refuse or neglect to attend their parish churches for the space of a month, without some lawful impediment.

These detestable provisions are to be found in a collection of the Articles, Canons, Orders, &c. of the Church of England, published by Sparrow in 1671, with the object, as his title-page declares, 'to vindicate the Church of England.'



But it is contended, that, in a National Church, *there must be* one uniform doctrine taught, and one form of worship universally enjoined. We are far from meaning to enter into a theological discussion, which would be most unfitted to these pages: But we may still observe, that the essential articles of Christianity are allowed on all hands to be few; and on these all denominations of Christians, with one exception, are agreed; that although some violent spirits might insist on enforcing their own peculiar opinions, even on points which they allowed to be of subordinate importance, yet that many would see the reasonableness of forbearing to *teach* such doctrines, so long as they were permitted freely to acknowledge their belief of them; that on matters of Church government, disputes have been mainly engendered by the intermixture of something not essentially connected with the question; as for example, the inveteracy of our forefathers against Episcopacy, arose chiefly out of its connexion with Prelacy;—because Bishops happened accidentally to be invested with great temporal power and splendour, and, instead of being chosen by other Bishops, with the consent of the clergy and people, were merely nominated by the Crown; and that thus Institutions, which in their corrupted state were rejected with abhorrence, might, when stript of these additions, be admitted without scruple; we should not hesitate also to say, that the fancied inconvenience of having the pulpits filled at different times with men of different opinions, is greatly overrated; that in point of fact *they are*, and ever must be so filled;—for no articles of religion can ever embrace all, or a hundredth part, of the topics which are discussed in public preaching; and that the Uniformity which subscription ensures, is much less important than that discordance, which it cannot prevent, in the tone of mind, in the moral opinions, nay in the very earnestness and seriousness of different ministers; so that the preaching of two men, both conscientiously subscribing to the same Confession of Faith, may lead their respective hearers to the most dissimilar views of religious duty; that indecent and personal controversy in the pulpit may be restrained by the proper authorities; but that the mere expression of different opinions on unessential points can produce no evil, so long as it is known that one good man will yet unavoidably differ in many of his sentiments and views of things from another, and that the agreement of men, so differing, in the main articles of Christian doctrine, is rather a satisfactory confirmation of *their* truth.

III. The Government and External Constitution of the Church of England are full of abuses, and bear divers marks of the mistaken notions and extreme misgovernment of the

times in which they were formed, and of those which neglected to amend them. It may never have occurred to some of our readers, that the Greek word which we translate 'Church,' *ἐκκλησία*, was the peculiar term used to denote the general assembly of the people in the old democracies; that it essentially expresses a 'popularly constituted meeting;' and that such, in great measure, was the original constitution of the Christian society. We need not say with what different associations our English version of it is now connected; we need not ask what popular elements are left, in a body in which the people have no voice at all, either by themselves or their representatives; where the chief officers, the Bishops, are appointed by the Crown, and are accountable to no one but the Archbishops and the Crown for the manner in which they discharge their trust. Anciently, indeed, the two Houses of Convocation may appear to some to have formed an Ecclesiastical Parliament—to have been respectively the aristocratical and democratical branches of the Legislature of the Church. But the truth is, that these represented, not the Church, but the Clergy; and even in this character, the proportion which the deputies of the parochial clergy bore to those of the Chapters, and to the Archdeacons and other such dignitaries, in the Lower House of Convocation, was about the same which the representatives of free boroughs in the House of Commons bear to those who are nominated by the influence of Government or of the Aristocracy. We are far, therefore, from regretting, that the Convocation is become no better than a name; But certainly its virtual annihilation has left the mass of the members of the Church, both lay and clerical, without any means of expressing their sentiments as a body; and the Church now deserves as little to be called a Society, as the army or the navy. Its actual governors, the Bishops, appointed by the Crown, and out of all proportion too few for the extent and population of England, afford about as apt an image of primitive Episcopacy, as the Consuls under the Roman empire did of the Consular government of the old commonwealth. Nominated as they now are—assisted by no ecclesiastical council—accountable to no general assembly of the Church, it were most dangerous to strengthen their powers, or even to wish that they should exert to the utmost those which they actually possess.

Then comes the system of Pluralities and of Dispensations,—the relics of the worst times of Popery, which the Protestant Church of England retains, even in the nineteenth century. One person may hold two benefices, if they are within forty

miles of one another;—and the distance is always computed, not by the number of miles along the road, but as if the incumbent could fly with the crow, or ride on a steeple-hunt from one of his cures to the other;—to say nothing of the absurdity of fixing on such a distance as the maximum to be allowed by law;—for if a minister can discharge his duties in a parish forty miles distant from him, he may just as easily fulfil them in one that is four hundred. Again, those persons who have taken degrees in Civil law, and the domestic chaplains of Noblemen, are permitted to hold two benefices. In the one case, this indulgence was granted to encourage a study which the clergy in ancient times always laboured to propagate; but now, amid the ignorance of the Civil law which prevails in England, and when the degree of Doctor of Laws does not necessarily imply an acquaintance with its simplest rudiments, its continuance is utterly ridiculous. In the other, it marks how little the Reformation in England was able to correct abuses patronized by the aristocracy; while the readiness with which the friends of the Church \* acquiesced in them, shows how greatly they wanted some of the most essential qualities in the character of perfect reformers. We notice the number of exempt jurisdictions, or of particular parishes, and in some instances large districts, not subject to the authority of any Bishop, merely as examples of evident abuses, even according to Episcopal principles, † and as showing again how imperfectly the Reformation in England was effected.

---

\* ‘For,’ says Hooker, while arguing in defence of the privileges granted to the chaplains of noblemen, ‘we are not to dream in this case of any platform *which bringeth equally high and low into parish churches*, nor of any constraint to maintain, at their own charge, those sufficient for that purpose; *the one so repugnant to the Majesty and Greatness of English Nobility*; the other so improbable and unlikely to take effect, that they which mention either or both, seem not indeed to have conceived what either is.’—*Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V. § 81.

The eloquence of Hooker has been deservedly praised; but the justice of the epithet ‘Judicious,’ which his admirers have attached to his name, is rather more questionable. Certainly there never was a more thoroughgoing advocate of things established, than he has shown himself in the whole Fifth Book, forming more than a third part of the entire *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

† Most of these, we suspect, were mere *jobs* from their very origin. There is still extant a Correspondence between Richard the Third, the Pope, and the Archbishop of York, relative to the erection of Middleham in Yorkshire into a deanery with a peculiar jurisdiction, independ-

We shall next mention the total want of any system of Education, peculiarly fitted for those who are to become ministers of the Church. It is not saying too much, to say, that the public schools at which boys in England commonly remain till sixteen or eighteen, do not so much as furnish the rudiments of a *clerical* education. The Universities, again, profess to know no distinctions between the future professions of those who solicit academical degrees—and they are quite right not to do so. They require of all who present themselves at their examinations, a certain portion of religious knowledge as Christians; but they do not pretend to say that this is a sufficient qualification for Christian *teachers*. The sole provision made at the Universities for the peculiar instruction of those who are designed for the Church, consists in the Lectures of the Divinity Professors; a certificate of having attended which is, we believe, always required by the Bishops, at the ordination of any person who has belonged to either University. It is with sincere pleasure that we hear testimony to the zealous and able exertions of the individual who now fills the Divinity Chair at Oxford; as, in addition to his public Lectures, he has formed a smaller class of students, who attend him voluntarily, and whom he examines as to their proficiency in such books as he has before recommended to their perusal. This is a practice worthy of the spirit and good sense of him who has first introduced it; but be it observed, that this only benefits the few. Attendance on these Lectures is entirely voluntary; and we do not want the means of furnishing instruction for those who desire it, but of ensuring an adequate amount of knowledge in that far larger class, who will gain of their own accord the smallest quantity that will be tolerated.

In other professions, interest affords a sufficient stimulus to industry; and besides, a young man intended for the law, or for the study of medicine, has in fact a distinct professional education to go through after leaving the University; whereas a young man intended for the Church, and quitting College, as is commonly the case at two-and-twenty, too often considers his education as completed, and employs the intervening year, before he is old enough to take orders, in

---

ent of the Diocesan. Richard, when Duke of Gloucester, had resided for some time at his castle of Middleham; and contracting a fondness for the place, he took this method of showing it; and the Pope and the Archbishop, as might be expected from the lax principles of the Church, in those days, seem to have made no difficulty in consenting to gratify him.

travelling on the Continent, or in refreshing himself in some way or other, after the fatigues of his academical studies. All that he must necessarily do, is to prepare himself for his examination by the Bishop's chaplain, previous to his ordination; and if he is idle, and conscious of his own ignorance, he tries to be ordained in a diocese where the chaplain has the reputation of not being over strict, and where he may pass the ordeal with little danger. For, the legal standard of the qualifications required in a candidate for orders being fitted only to the general ignorance of the Elizabethan age, every examining chaplain is obliged to fix a standard of his own; and thus a candidate, whom one Bishop might dismiss as utterly incompetent, may be ordained without difficulty by another. In other professions also, a man's gradual advancement is somewhat dependent on his continued exertions; he cannot at least safely afford to remain stationary, far less to go backward in knowledge, after he has once commenced his career. But when a clergyman is once ordained priest, his qualifications are subjected to no further trial; all is then left to his own sense of duty; and it often happens, with careless and unprincipled individuals, that they are worse divines at forty than they were at four-and-twenty. In such cases as these, the effect, we will not say of having been educated, but of having passed a certain portion of time at the Universities, is nothing but evil. Habits of dissipation and self-indulgence are acquired, and those aristocratical feelings which, in weak and vicious minds, are merely odious, are strongly confirmed. Thus, some of the English clergy are, above all other Christian ministers, unfit for their station. Without being superior to the humblest dissenting teachers in secular learning, they are incomparably inferior to them in that familiarity with the Scriptures, for the absence of which, in a minister of the gospel, not the greatest learning could compensate. But this is the universal characteristic of the English system of education, that while it produces some individuals of the rarest excellence, its failure in unfavourable cases is most complete.

Such then are the principal points in the actual state of the Church of England which seems to us to demand the attention, and the reforming hand of the national Legislature. No other power can undertake so great a work; and to no other, in our opinion, should it ever be intrusted. For, what though the State has, on some occasions, as the author of the 'Letters' justly remarks, abused its sovereign authority, and by the appointment of State fasts and festivals has really done an injury to the character of the Church, yet the words of Burke are here most applicable, that 'it is not so much by the assumption of un-

‘lawful powers, as by the unwise and unwarrantable use of those which are most legal, that governments oppose their true end and object—for there is such a thing as tyranny as well as usurpation.’—‘So that after all, it is a moral and virtuous discretion, and not any abstract theory of right, which keeps governments faithful to their ends.’\* It is the exercise of this ‘moral and virtuous discretion,’ to which we look forward with hope, for the purification of the Church of England from all those spots and stains which the State, for its own purposes, has thrown upon it, no less than from those which had their origin in its own negligence or ignorance. And in our judgment the true friends to the Church should join their exertions to procure, not its emancipation from the State, but its reform by the State; as the first would involve its certain destruction as a national institution; while from the other, both in this character, and as a spiritual society, it would derive at once purity and energy.

If, in any part of our preceding strictures, we may seem to have spoken too strongly, let the peculiar circumstances of the case plead our apology. The Government has been so long accustomed to regard the Church establishment as a thing not to be touched, that nothing will ever arouse them from this apathy but the strongest representation of the evils which they are neglecting to remove. On the other hand, we have endeavoured to treat the subject seriously and calmly, not only from our own sense of its importance, but to convince if possible the advocates of existing abuses, that those who wish their removal are not all the enemies of religion or of religious establishments; that they are neither fanatical enthusiasts, nor infidels, nor jacobins, nor hold any principles inconsistent with the sincerest attachment to the main doctrines of Christianity, as held by the Church of England itself. We are not now called upon to state the particular nature and precise extent of the reforms which we deem desirable; our opinions, indeed, on this point, may be partly gathered from the list of evils which we have given; but the main object at present to be accomplished, is to draw the public attention to the State of the Church, and to show to every man’s understanding that it ought not to be left as it is. Above all, we wish to dispel that cloud of prejudice which, on this question, besets the minds of so large a portion, not of the clergy only, but of the gentlemen of England—to expose some of those parrot-like phrases, which, to the disgrace of human reason, so often bind men’s minds with a secret and

---

\* Speech on the Unitarian Petition, Works, vol. x. 8vo edit.

sovereign charm. Such are the expressions which we so often hear of the 'Constitution in Church and State,' of its 'venerable Establishment,' of its 'heroic Martyrs,' its 'pious and learned Reformers,' and of 'the mild and tolerant spirit of its 'Doctrines and its Ministers.' We call these parrot-like phrases—because, as they are commonly used, they are all either untrue or irrelevant. 'The Constitution in Church and State!' Why it is like the feet of the image in Nebuchadnezzar's dream, which were made part of iron, and part of miry clay; the State strong and sound, gradually perfected by the care of successive generations, carefully watched, and continually repaired;—the Church patched up in a hurry three hundred years ago, out of elements confessedly corrupted, and ever since allowed to subsist, unlooked to and unattended, as if, like the water of the Thames, it would grow pure by the mere lapse of time. We would ask, who would wish to live under our Political Government, such as it was when our Church Government was established? And if the former has required, since that time, a series of improvements, can we believe that the experience and added light of three hundred years, could now add nothing to the perfect excellence of the latter? 'The venerable Establishment!' We would ask, whether the venerable Cathedral Churches of that establishment have sustained injury from the cleaning, repairing, and removing of deformities, to which the taste and liberality of so many of our Deans and Chapters have been of late years so happily directed? or whether the ornaments added in the reigns of Elizabeth and James the First, were all so pure and so judicious, that it would have been barbarism and folly to meddle with them? The Church of England *has* no doubt had its 'heroic martyrs;'—but so has the Church of Rome: and so have all Christian communions; and besides, is it not a little preposterous to invoke the names of those who died in the cause of reformation, in aid of an argument that their example of reform should never be followed again? It has had too 'its pious and learned Reformers,' and we wish that it would produce some more—equal in piety, and superior in judgment and enlightened views, to those of the sixteenth century.

A real knowledge of those times—not such a mere heap of prejudices as so many pick up from Isaac Walton, and other such sources—would enable us to appreciate their excellences and their defects; would show us that we may admire them far more safely than imitate them; that though no period has produced a greater display of ability, yet that our additional experience of two hundred and fifty years gives us the same superiority of judgment over them, that many an or-

inary schoolmaster possesses over a very clever boy; who, if he were as old as his master, would in all points surpass him. Such a knowledge too, would enable us justly to appreciate the panegyrics which have been passed on the 'mild and tolerant spirit' of the Church of England. It would tell us of the continued persecutions which disgraced the reign of Elizabeth, and of those which added an additional brand of infamy to that dark period between the Restoration and the Revolution. It would show us, above all, that in the sixteenth century a comprehensive spirit of Christian charity was unknown to all parties; and that the judgment even of the best men of that age, as to the number and nature of the points to be insisted on as terms of communion, is of very little value.

Thus, when the merits of the Church of England are reduced to their just proportions, and no longer magnified to our eyes by the mists of our own ignorance, the faults of its institutions will appear in their true colours, and we shall wonder by what strange infatuation they can have been so long mistaken for excellences. Then it will be time to discuss more particularly the exact nature of the reforms best adapted to the state of the case:—with what limitations the two grand principles of rendering the Constitution of the Church more popular and more effective, and of making its terms of communion more comprehensive, should be followed up in practice. So slowly does truth force its way, in opposition to existing prejudices and interests, that we dare not indulge the hope of seeing such a reform accomplished in our days. Yet a little impulse is sometimes sufficient to set in motion the stream of public opinion, which, gathering force year after year, from continual accessions of experience and reflection, swells at last into an irresistible current, and sweeps away the stubbornest mudbanks of corruption and error.

---

#### NOTES AND ADDITIONS.

---

Since the remarks on the Man with the Iron Mask, at page 8, &c. of this volume were printed, we have learned that very serious doubts are entertained by some of the most knowing and discerning men in France, whether the Papers published by Delort amount to a proof of the identity of Matthioli with the prisoner who died in the Bastille in 1703. We are not apprised of the precise grounds of their doubt, nor exactly of its extent. But we believe that they admit the genuineness of M. Delort's Papers; and therefore acknowledge the treacherous seizure and cruel detention of Matthioli, his transfer



from Pignerol to Exilles, and from that fortress to the Isles St Marguerite. That he arrived at the last mentioned Islands on the 30th of April 1687, seems indeed to be demonstrated. (Ellis, 340.) But after that period, there is only one official despatch published by Delort, and it does not name Matthioli. The conclusive evidence of identity therefore stops at that moment. In all the rest of the chain of proofs, the links are of baser and more brittle metal. Yet we cannot help thinking that, in all ordinary cases, the circumstantial evidence, even in this latter part, though certainly of inferior force, would be deemed sufficient. The despatches show that St Mars brought a mysterious prisoner from Exilles to St Marguerite in 1687. An account by a descendant of St Mars, published by Mr Crawford, shows that officer to have brought a mysterious and masked prisoner from St Marguerite to the Bastille in 1698. All accounts before published, however otherwise varying, seem to agree that the same prisoner was in the custody of St Mars at Pignerol, at Exilles, at the Isles St Marguerite, and in the Bastille. No other account has ever been given of the fate of Matthioli. In addition to these circumstances much importance must be ascribed to the declaration of Louis XV. to Mad. de Pompadour, that the Prisoner with the Iron Mask was the minister of an Italian Prince—and some to the fact, that the prisoner was buried with the Italian and kindred name of Maschiali. But, on the other hand, it may be asked, why the evidence of official documents is entirely wanting in the latter parts of this transaction? M. Delort should have given such an explanation as would have made this question needless. Was M. Hauterive's jealousy the obstacle to a fuller publication? Whatever may be the real state of the case, the doubts of historians, so much and so very justly celebrated as M. Daru and M. Barante, are sufficient reasons for some pause before judgment, among foreign critics.

---

IN reference to the passage at page 33, where the question as to the *internal evidence* of the authorship of the Icon Basilike is discussed, the following note should have been inserted.

This very controversy affords a remarkable instance of the ease with which the most discriminating of human judgments may deceive themselves, respecting these probabilities of genuineness flowing from the matter and manner of a writing, which are too boldly called 'Internal Evidence.'—'When we view the internal evidence,' says Mr Hume, 'derived from the *style and composition*, there is no comparison. These meditations, in *elegance, purity, neatness and simplicity*, resemble the genius of those performances which we know with certainty to have flowed from the Royal pen; But as so unlike the bombast, perplexed, rhetorical and corrupt style of Dr Gauden, that no human testimony seems sufficient to convince us that he was the author.'

Now, let the reader try, by Mr Hume's test, the following sentences from the eighth Section of the Icon, relating to the execution of Sir J. Hotham (who refused to surrender Hull to the King) and his son, for treachery to the Parliament. 'They (*i. e.* the Hothams) might have expected another reward from him, than thus to divide their heads from their bodies, whose hearts were divided with them from their King.'—'The cutting off one head in a family, is not enough to expiate the affront done to the Head of the Commonwealth. The eldest son must be involved in the punishment; as he was infected with the sin of the father, against the father of his country. Root and branch God cuts off in one day.'

Can there be a more perfect example of a bombast, rhetorical, and corrupt style?

---

To the note on the Sidney Papers, at pp. 47 and 48, the following addition should have been made.

Another Letter in the Sidney Collection, from Lord Spencer to Dorothy Sidney his lady, probably written in October 1642, shows still more clearly the licentious manners of Charles's Court, and the grossness of his own conversation. '*He (i. e. the King) was very cheerful; and by the \* \* \* \* discourse, I thought I had been in the drawing-room.*'—(Sidney Papers, 11. 668.) Even the civil war had not taught decency to the King and his Court. In the following year, Lord Spencer fell at the battle of Newbury, for the Royal cause.

---

In reference to the pretended anatomical discoveries of Gall and Spurzheim, alluded to at page 312, the following Note should have been added.

Those who wish to see this subject treated in a full, scientific, and satisfactory manner, are referred to a short but masterly work of the late lamented Dr Gordon, published in 1817, under the title of "Observations on the Structure of the Brain, comprising an Estimate of the Claims of Drs Gall and Spurzheim to Discovery in the Anatomy of that Organ."

In this admirable production, the author, we think, has clearly demonstrated, 1st, that the Phrenological Doctors have no sort of claim to originality, as to the far greater part of the anatomical facts they have held out as their discoveries; and, 2d, that all that is really original in their anatomy is quite unsound and erroneous, and founded either on the most idle conjectures, or on a mere trick in the manner of operation, scarcely reconcileable with the dignity of scientific investigation.

---

SINCE our Article on the Abolition of the Corn Laws was sent to press, \* an Order in Council, dated the 1st of September, has appeared, authorizing the importation of oats, oatmeal, rye, peas and beans, until forty days after the meeting of Parliament. Oats are subject to a duty of 2s. a quarter, oatmeal to a duty of 2s. 6d. a boll, and rye, peas and beans, to a duty of 3s. 6d. a quarter. There can be no doubt, considering the extraordinary deficiency in the crop of oats, that the ports must have opened for their importation on the 15th of November. But ministers are, notwithstanding, most justly entitled to the public thanks, for having issued the Order in question; for if the ports had been allowed to remain shut until the middle of November, it would have been no longer possible to make any importations from the great Northern markets previously to the spring; and the means that might otherwise have been afforded for alleviating the pressure of the existing scarcity, must have been comparatively trifling.

The effects that have attended the free importation of oats, are precisely such as we anticipated. Our prices gave way in the first instance; but they speedily rallied, and have been for some time on the advance. The prices of oats, oatmeal, &c. at Amsterdam, Hamburg, and other markets contiguous to Great Britain, immediately advanced to near our level.

---

\* By an error of the press, the 10th of September is mentioned in the note to p. 340, instead of the 2d.

## INDEX.

---

- Abolition* of the Corn Laws, what quantity of foreign grain would be introduced upon the, and what proportion it would bear to our annual consumption, 325—proofs drawn from the experience of former years, when the ports were open, 326—whether prices would be depressed according to the rate supposed, by the, 327—price at which corn might be imported from Dantzic upon the, 328—estimate of the average price at which corn might be sold after the, 334—how farmers and landlords would be affected by the, 335—pernicious fluctuations in prices that must occur until the, 336—estimate of the pecuniary sum that would be saved by the, 341—various advantages that would result from the, 345.
- Acquisitiveness*, whether a distinct and independent faculty, 271.
- Administratives Mœurs*, character of the work entitled, 156—general observations suggested by the work, 158—motives and design of the author in writing it, 162—forcible and lively extracts from, 163.
- Admiral Coligni*, life of, when attempted, and by whom, 127.
- Africa*, Northern and Central, opening for the exploring of, where and how furnished, 175—information gained by the expedition to, concerning the nature of an Arab caravan merchant, 176—description of an Arab chief, who was the protector of the mission to, 177—remarkable features of a desert of, 178—description of the lake Tchad in, 180—description of the kingdom of Bornou in, 183—in what manufacture the Bornouese have attained some excellence, and what is their intellectual condition, 185—attack upon the Felatah town of Dirkullah in, and by whom, 191—its unfortunate issue, 192—imminent dangers encountered by Major Denham, the explorer of, 193—account of the African men-traps, 195—description of the Shoua Arabs, called Dugganahs, in, 199—account of the Felatahs in, 201—account of Sackatoo, capital of the Felatah empire, 202—prominent distinctions of the inhabitants of, 206.
- Alchouses*, licensing, disadvantages of the practice, from its encouraging monopoly, 443—instance of the monopoly thus produced, 444—connexion of the practice of, with the morals of the people, 447—corruption introduced by the custom of, 449.

*Alliance between Church and State*, disadvantages attending the, 497.  
*Anjou*, Duke of, privy to all the consultations that led to the massacre of St Bartholomew, 102.

*Arab caravan merchant*, description of an, 176.

*Bartholomew*, St, massacre of, character of Dr John Lingard as an historian in relating the, 95—proofs of his inaccuracy in the narration of, 96—instances of carelessness in research in depicting the, 99—what was the cause of the, according to Lingard, 100—fallacy of this view, 101—descriptions of the delight received by Charles from the, 105—proofs of the general plan on which the, was perpetrated, 110—refutation of the statement of Dr Lingard concerning the number of those who perished in the, 112—actual number of those who perished in the, 115—when the, was concerted, 118—instances of misrepresentation by Dr Lingard on the subject of the, 121—description of the enormities of the, 125—attempts to palliate its atrocities considered, 137.

*Basilike*, Icon, claims of Dr Gauden to be the author of, 10—letters of Dr Gauden to Lord Clarendon, furnishing strong presumptive evidence of his being the author of, 12—proof of Lord Clarendon's acquiescence in the claim of Dr Gauden to be the author of, 16—demonstration of the continued belief of Lord Clarendon that Dr Gauden was the author of, 19—silence of Lord Clarendon on the subject, a proof that he believed Dr Gauden to be the author of, 21—refutation of some arguments designed to show that Charles I. was the author of the, 26—who were privy to Dr Gauden's composition of the, 30.

*Bellievre*, description by, of the massacre of St Bartholomew, 125.

*Bernstorff*, condition of Denmark under the administration of, 383.

*Bilna*, solitude of, in Africa, what kind of structure observed in, 179.

*Bornou*, kingdom of, described, 183—population of, and what degree of civilization prevails in, 184—in what manufacture they have attained some excellence, 185—physiognomy of the inhabitants of, ib.—whether destitute of speculative curiosity, 186.

*Brain*, in what sense the action of the, is essential to our mental operations, 257.

*Britain, Great*, how much the population of, has increased since 1800, 322.

*Boo-Khaloom*, protector of the Mission to Central Africa, account of, 177—visit of, to Bornou, 181—his reception at Bornou, 182—ghrazzie, or slave-hunt, projected by, into the mountains of Mandara, 180—attack of, upon Dirkullah, 191—wounds received by, 192—retreat of, from Dirkullah, 193—amiable traits in his character, 196.

*Buonaparte, Napoleon*, answer to his request for a passport to America, and by whom, 386—letter of, and to whom, 387—his conduct in the Bellerophon, 388—unworthy treatment of, by the British Government, 391.

*Catharine of Medicis*, character of, 134.

*Captain Clapperton*, visit of, to the country of the Felatahs, 201—description of the town of Kano by, 202—interview of, with Sultan Bello, 203.

*Captain Maitland*, account of, with the character of his narrative, 385—conversation of, with Captain Savary, 386—answer of, to a letter from Buonaparte, 388—testimony of, to the unexceptionable demeanour of Buonaparte on board the *Bellerophon*, 389—passage of a letter of, to Lord Keith, 390—his conduct to Napoleon, 394.

*Central and Northern Africa*, opening for the exploring of, where and how furnished, 175—information gained by the expedition to, concerning the nature of an Arab caravan merchant, 176—description of an Arab chief, who was the protector of the Mission to, 177—remarkable features of a desert of, 178—description of the lake Tchad in, 180—description of the kingdom of Bornou in, 183—in what manufacture the Bornouese have attained some excellence, and what is their intellectual condition, 185—attack upon the Felatah town of Dirkullah in, and by whom, 191—its unfortunate issue, 192—imminent dangers encountered by Major Denham, the explorer of, 193—account of the African men-traps, 195—description of the Shoua Arabs, called Duggaahs, in, 199—account of the Felatahs in, 201—account of Sackatoo, capital of the Felatah empire, 202—prominent distinctions of the inhabitants of, 206.

*Censures*, *Spiritual*, unlawfulness, and mischief of enforcing, by temporal pains and penalties, 492.

*Charles II. of England*, when and by whom his conversion to Catholicism first discovered, 24.

*Charles IX.*, insincerity of, in his professions to the Hugonots, 131—anecdotes concerning, 132.

*Church of England*, Letters on the, 49—what consequences would ensue were its alliance with the State dissolved, 491—argument for the alliance of the, with the State, refuted, and by whom, 495—evils and abuses of the, 502.

*Clapperton, Captain*, visit of, to the country of the Felatahs, 201—description of the town of Kano, visited by, 202—interview of, with Sultan Bello, 203.

*Clarendon, Lord*, letter of, to the Bishop of Exeter, 14—proof of the acquiescence of, in the claim of Dr Gauden to be the author of the Icon Basilike, 16—demonstration of his continued belief concerning Gauden's valid claim to be esteemed the author of the Icon Basilike, 19—his history when first correctly published, and by whom, 37—instances of suppressed passages restored, 39.

*Clarke, Rev. Edward Daniel*, account of some of his ancestors, 220—anecdotes concerning, 221—his residence at Cambridge University, 223—copious extracts from his descriptions, 228.

*Coligni, Admiral*, life of, when attempted, and by whom, 127.

*Colour*, whether perceived by the eye, 287.

*Combe, George*, character of his System of Phrenology, 253—extracts from it, 274.

- Commercial Revulsions*, what kind of, lie in the sphere of the economist, and what causes produce, 70—operation of these causes exemplified, 72—what would diminish the frequency of, 75—connection of the currency with, 79—impropriety of the clamour raised against the theory of the Economists, because they did not predict the late revulsion, 81—improvements of Government on the currency insufficient to prevent, 91.
- Comte de Struensee*, account of his elevation under Christian VII., 366—fluctuating character of, 368—instances of his impolitic administration, 369—what caused the conspiracy to subvert his administration, 370—execution of, 372—answer made by his counsel to the charges preferred against him, ib.
- Continental markets*, from which of, the greatest quantity of grain could be imported, 327.
- Corn*, computation of the annual consumption of, and by whom, 320—estimate of the total consumption of, in the United Kingdom, 323.
- Corn Laws*, what quantity of foreign grain would be introduced upon the repeal of the, and what proportion it would bear to our annual consumption, 325—proofs drawn from the experience of former years, when the ports were open, 326—whether prices would be depressed according to the rate supposed, by the repeal of the, 327—price at which corn might be imported from Dantzic, upon the abolition of the, 328—estimate of the average price at which corn might be sold, upon the repeal of the, 334—how landlords and farmers would be affected by their repeal, 335—pernicious fluctuations in prices that must occur until their repeal, 336—estimate of the pecuniary sum that would be saved by their abolition, 341—various advantages that would result from the repeal of, 345.
- Court of France*, condition of the, under Louis XIV, 416—by whom its profligacy was unfolded, ib.—by whom its transactions were regulated, 421.
- Danish monarchy*, formerly elective, 360—when and how rendered hereditary, 363—despotism introduced into the, 364—consequences of its introduction, 365.
- Danish Revolution*, when brought about, and by whom, 371.
- Dantzic*, estimate of the price at which corn might be imported from, to London, 328—cause of the depressed price of corn in, 329.
- Denham*, Major, travels and discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, character of the narrative of, by, 174—how and where an opening was furnished, which enabled him to explore the interior of Africa, 175—who was assigned as the guide of, to Bornou, 176—account of Boo-Khaloom, the guide of, 177—appalling spectacle witnessed by, and where, 178—description of the lake Tchad, by, 180—reception of, at Bornou, 182—retreat of, from Dirkullah, and imminent hazard encountered by, 192—participation in the expedition against the Mungira, and objects observed by, in it, 195—account of the Logguene, visited by, 197—character of the Shoua Arabs by, 199.

- Denmark*, literary and political character of, 383.
- Dirkullah*, attack upon the Felatah town of, 191.
- Discussions*, Parliamentary, when first published in detail, 459—vast influence they exert over the public opinion, 460—advantages attending the publicity of, 465.
- Duke of Anjou*, privy to the whole plot of the massacre of St Bartholomew, 153.
- Duc de Broglie*, extract from the discourse of, 157.
- Duc de St Simon*, Memoirs of, light thrown on the reign of Louis XIV, by, 416.
- Edwards, Dr*, abuses occasioned by the system of licensing alehouses pointed out by, 449—extracts from his Letters, 450.
- England*, Church of, Letters on the, and by whom, 490—what consequences would ensue, were its alliance with the State dissolved, 491—argument for the alliance of, with the State, refuted, and by whom, 495—evils and abuses of the, 502.
- Emancipation* of the Irish Catholics, advantages that would result from the, 472.
- Episcopalian*, letters on the Church by an, 490—their merits, 491.
- Erskine*, Lord, inestimable services of, to his country, 399.
- Falkenshiold*, General, account of, and character of his Memoirs, 360 his sufferings and confinement, 377.
- Farmers*, benefits that would redound to, upon the abolition of the Corn Laws, 395.
- Felatah* town of Dirkullah, attack upon, and by whom, 191—capital of the Felatahs, 202.
- Form*, whether the power of perceiving, implies a distinct and peculiar faculty, 288.
- France*, Court of, condition of the, under Louis XIV, 416—by whom its profligacy was unfolded, *ib.*—by whom its transactions were then regulated, 421—favourable circumstances in the present political condition of, 157—unpromising circumstances in its present political situation, 159—hostility of the fanaticism prevalent in, to the advancement of free principles in, 160—undue influence possessed by the monarch, adverse to the advancement of free principles.
- Gall, Dr*, opinion of, regarding a faculty supposed to be situated in a certain part of the brain, 274.
- Gauden, Dr*, short account of, 9—claims of, to be considered the author of Icon Basilike, 10—letters of, to Lord Clarendon, furnishing strong presumptive evidence of his being the author of Icon Basilike, 12—proofs of Lord Clarendon's acquiescence in the claim of, to be its author, 16—demonstration of the continued belief of Lord Clarendon that he was the author of it, 19—silence of Lord Clarendon on the subject, a proof that he believed him to be the author of it, 21—who were privy to his composition of it, 30.



*Gibson, Mr*, account by, of the exports of wheat from Riga and Dantzic, 324.

*Great Britain*, how much the population of, has increased since 1800, 322.

*Hamburg*, average price of corn in, 332.

*Hamilton, Mr*, his system for teaching languages, 49—principles of his system exemplified, 50—its advantages, 51—fault in the mode of executing it, 55—objections to the system of, refuted, 57—arguments against the system, from the celerity with which languages are learned by it, obviated, 60—instances of success attending the system, 64.

*History*, Parliamentary and Review, plan of the publication entitled, 466—merits of the work, 467—able extracts from it, 470—instances of misrepresentation in, 479.

*Hope*, the sentiment of, whence arises, and whether a distinct faculty, 282.

*Huskisson, Mr*, his great exertions to improve our commercial policy, 359.

*Icon Basilike*, claims of Dr Gauden to be the author of, 10—letters of Dr Gauden to Lord Clarendon, furnishing strong presumptive evidence of his being the author of, 12—proofs of Lord Clarendon's acquiescence in the claim of Dr Gauden to be the author of, 16—demonstration of the continued belief of Lord Clarendon that Dr Gauden was the author of, 19—silence of Lord Clarendon on the subject, a proof that he believed Dr Gauden to be the author of, 21—refutation of some arguments designed to show that Charles I. was the author of the, 26—who were privy to Dr Gauden's composition of the, 30.

*Ireland*, amount of its population, 321—what number of the population of, subsist on corn, 322—how many quarters of grain are annually consumed in, ib.

*Irish Catholics*, advantages that would result from the emancipation of the, 472.

*Iron Mask*, man with the, who is proved to have been the, 3.

*Jacob, Mr*, account by, of the annual exports of wheat and rye from Dantzic for twenty-five years, 324—mission of, for what purpose, and how executed, 325.

*Joint-Stock Companies*, utility of, 475.

*Judges*, dependent condition of, before the Revolution, 401—acts of Kings William and George concerning, 403—circumstance still affecting the independence of, 404—plan for preventing the translation of, 410.

*Kano*, town of, described, 201—population of, and the degree of refinement characterizing the inhabitants of, 201.

*Kempis, Thomas a*, who is generally allowed to have been the author of the book entitled, and how long the controversy concerning it was agitated, 2.

*Kinnaird*, Lord, character of his Letter to the Peers of Scotland, 397—refutation by, of some opinions of the Peers, 400.

*Kouka*, capital of Bornou, 181.

*Land-tax*, on whom the, falls, 355.

*Landlords*, benefits that would accrue to, from the repeal of the Corn Laws, 335.

*Licensing alehouses*, disadvantages of the practice of, from its encouraging monopoly, 443,—instance of monopoly thus produced, 444—connection of the practice of, with the morals of the people, 447—corruption introduced by the custom of, 449.

*Lingard*, Dr John, History of England by, 94—character of, as an historian in relating the massacre of St Bartholomew, 95—proofs of inaccuracy in the narration of it, 96—instances of carelessness in research, 99—what the cause of the massacre of St Bartholomew, according to, 100—fallacy of this view, 101—refutation of the statement of, concerning the number of those who perished in the massacre, 112—examples of misrepresentation in, 125.

*Loggonese*, character of the, 197.

*Lombardy*, description of, and by whom, 228.

*Louis XIV*, character of his reign, and by whom it was unmasked, 416—by whom swayed in his administration, 421.

*Madame de Maintenon*, short account of, 418—how she ingratiated herself with Louis XIV, 419—way in which her ascendant was exercised over Louis XIV, and by whom described, 421—character of her correspondence, 424—extracts from it, 425.

*Maitland*, Captain, account of, and the character of his narrative, 385—conversation of, with Captain Savary, 386—answer of, to a letter from Buonaparte, 388—testimony of, to the unexceptionable demeanour of Buonaparte on board the Bellerophon, 389—passage of a letter of, to Lord Keith, 390—his conduct to Napoleon, 394.

*Major Denham*, travels and discoveries in Northern and Central Africa, character of its narrative of, by, 174—how and where an opening was furnished which enabled him to explore the interior of Africa, 175—who was assigned as the guide of, to Bornou, 176—account of Boon-Khaloom the guide of, 177—appalling spectacle witnessed by, and where, 178—description of the lake T'chad, by, 180—reception of, at Bornou, 182—retreat of, from Dirkullah, and imminent hazard encountered by, 192.

*Magistracy*, advantages of an unpaid, 441.

*Man with the Iron Mask*, who is proved to have been the, 3.

*Mandara*, kingdom and mountains of, described, 189.

*Marriage*, remarks on the English Laws relating to, 496.

*Massacre*, of St Bartholomew, character of Dr John Lingard as an historian in relating the, 95—proofs of his inaccuracy in the narration of the, 96—instances of carelessness in research in depicting the, 99—what was the cause of the, according to Lingard, 100—fallacy of this

view, 101—description of the delight received by Charles from the, 105—proofs of the general plan on which the, was perpetrated, 110,—refutation of the statement of Dr Lingard concerning the number of, those who perished in the, 115—when the, was concerted, 118,—instances of misrepresentation by Dr Lingard on the subject of the, 121—description of the enormities of the, 125—attempts to palliate its atrocities considered, 137.

*Molesworth, Lord*, picture of the state of Denmark, by, 364.

*Monk, General*, character of, 39.

*Montbary Prince de*, character of, 434—short account of his life, 435.

*Niger*, name of, whence derived, by whom imposed, light thrown on the problem concerning the, and by whom, 209—conjecture concerning the termination of that Nigar explored by Park, 211.

*North of Europe*, agricultural capabilities of the, 326.

*Order*, whether the sentiment of, be a distinct and original faculty of the mind, 272.

*Organ*, term of, improperly used by the Phrenologists, 256.

*Oudney, Dr*, visit of, to the Felatahs, 200.

*Oxford*, University of, claim of the, to the public gratitude, 37.

*Papal Benediction*, ceremony of the, decried, 231.

*Parliamentary discussions*, when first published in detail, 459—vast influence they exert over public opinion, 460—advantages attending the publicity of, 465.

*Parliamentary History and Review*, plan of the publication entitled, 466—merits of the work, 467—able extracts from the, 470—instances of misrepresentation in, 479.

*Peers of Scotland*, disabilities attaching to, 398.

*Phrenology*, where the system of, prevails most, and why, 254—general proposition of the system of, examined, 255—what positions must be true if the theory be correct, 258—whether the assertions of the supporters of, is true, that the mind knows not the existence of the organs of sense, 259—conclusive objections against the system of, 261—why the intellectual faculties need most material organs, 262—distribution of faculties in the system of, compared with that of metaphysical writers, 264—how the excessive multiplication of faculties in the system of, militates against its truth, 268—whether what is termed Acquisitiveness in the system of, be a distinct and independent faculty, 271—shallowness and puerility of the theory of, shown by the absurd reasonings of its founders, 274—preposterous reasonings concerning the organ of Individuality by the abettors of, 278—contradictory and self-refuting statements of the chief supporters of, 280—whether Hope is properly termed a primitive faculty in the system of, 282—absurdity of appending to Hope an antagonist faculty, 283—whether colour and form are perceived by distinct faculties, as is maintained in the theory of, 288—mistake of ascribing the perception of size and weight to distinct faculties, committed by the patrons of, 291—why no proofs

in defence of, can be sufficiently clear and conclusive, 297—decisive arguments in refutation of, 301.

*Poland*, agricultural condition of, 321.

*Prices*, how they would be affected by the abolition of the Corn Laws, 1327.

*Princess Palatine*, Letters of the, disclosures made by the, regarding the reign of Louis XIV, 416.

*Prince de Montbarey*, character of, 434—short account of his life, 435.

*Quarantine Laws*, propriety of the, urged, 475.

*Queen Mary*, why any dispute was ever made regarding her participation in the murder of Darnley, 2.

*Revolution*, Danish, when brought about, and by whom, 371.

*Revolutions*, Commercial, what kind of, lie in the sphere of the economist, and what causes produce, 70—operation of these causes exemplified, 72—what would diminish the frequency of, 75—connection of the currency with, 79—impropriety of the clamour raised against the theory of the Economists, because they did not predict the late revolution, 81—improvements of Government on the currency insufficient to prevent, 91.

*Sackatoo*, capital of the Felatah empire, described, 203.

*Scotland*, disabilities attaching to the Peers of, 398.

*Shary*, river of, in Central Africa, 196—its magnitude, and the rate at which it flows, 197.

*Sheik of Bornou*, what power possessed by the, 187—battle fought by the, and with whom, 198.

*Shoua Arabs*, called Dugganahs, account of the, 190.

*Size*, whether the perception of, involves a peculiar and original faculty, 290.

*Slave trade* in Africa, how carried on, 207.

*Smith, Mr Charles*, computation of, concerning the annual consumption of corn, 320.

*Spiritual* censures, unlawfulness and mischief of enforcing, by temporal pains and penalties, 492.

*Spurzheim, Dr*, opinion of, regarding a faculty supposed to be seated in a certain part of the brain, 274.

*State*, what consequences would ensue were its alliance with the Church of England dissolved, 491.

*Struensee, Comte de*, account of his elevation under Christian VII, 366—fluctuating character of, 368—instances of his impolitic administration, 369—what caused the conspiracy to subvert the administration of, 370—execution of, 372—answers made by his counsel to the charges preferred against him, *ib.*

*Tavannes*, policy recommended by, to the Court of France, 127.

*Tchad*, great lake of, description of the, 180.

*Thomas a Kempis*, who is generally allowed to have been the author of the book entitled, and how long the controversy concerning it was agitated, 2.

*Tithes*, when they fall upon consumers, 353.

*Tripoli*, favourable opening furnished at, for exploring Africa, 175.

*Walker*, the curate of Dr Gauden, testimony of, regarding the Icon Basilike, 31.

*Warburton, Bishop*, his argument on the advantages of an alliance of Church and State, 494.—remarks on it, and by whom, 495—observations on a quotation of, from Icon Basilike, 497.

*Weight*, whether the power of perceiving, involves a peculiar and distinct faculty, 291.

*Williams, Mr*, vindicated as to his exertions for the reform of Chancery abuses, 482.

*Wordsworth, Dr*, character of, as a controversialist, 7.

END OF VOLUME FORTY-FOURTH.

*No. LXXXIX. will be published in December.*











